DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 195 HE 025 037

TITLE	Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1990-91. A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Supplemental Language to the 1979, 1981, and 1990 Budget Acts.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	CPEC-R-91-14
PUB DATE	Sep 91
NOTE	71p.; For related document, see HE 025 036.
AVAILABLE FROM	California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985 (free).
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; College Administration; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Compensation (Remuneration); Full Time Faculty; Higher Education; Part Time Faculty; *Salaries; School Policy; *State Colleges; *State Universities; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	California State Postsecondary Education Comm; California State University; University of California

ABSTRACT

This report examines faculty salaries at the California Community Colleges, and executive compensation at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges. Following an executive summary, Part 1 of the report presents an overview of faculty salaries in the California community colleges. It also discusses several policy implications of the community college data and the Commission's role in examining the use of part-time faculty by the college. Part 2 contains a special analysis of compensation for selected executives of the California State University and the University of California in light of compensation of similar executive positions at other comparable systems and institutions. Also discussed is the State University and University of California policies regarding outside income and employment of these executives compared to the policies employed by comparative systems and institutions as well as the procedures used by the segments to establish and maintain executive compensation. Additionally, the report compares the salaries of selected campus-based administrators with those at comparison institution campuses and reviews the salaries paid to community college executives in California. The appendix contains selected policies of California State University, the University of California, and comparison institutions. Contains 12 references. (GLR)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

California Post-Secondary Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED338195

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1990-91

Community College Faculty • District Superintendents • Campus Presidents • Executives of the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office • Chancellor of the California State University • Executive Vice Chancellor • Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs • Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs • Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations • Vice Chancellor, University Affairs • General Counsel • Campus Presidents • Campus-Based Administrators • President of the University of California • Senior Vice President - Academic Affairs • Senior Vice President - Administration • Vice President - Budget and University Relations • Vice President - Health Affairs • Campus Chancellors • Campus-Based Administrator Positions

HE 025 037

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary

This is the sixth in a series of yearly reports that supplement the Commission's annual reports on faculty salaries in California's two public universities. This year's report deals with faculty salaries at the California Community Colleges, and on executive compensation at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges.

Following an executive summary, Part One of the report presents an overview of faculty salaries in the California Community Colleges and estimates the mean salary of full-time regular contract faculty at $49,268. It also discusses several policy implications of the community college data and the Commission's role in examining the use of part-time faculty by the colleges.

Part Two contains a special analysis of compensation for selected executives of the California State University and the University of California in light of compensation of similar executive positions at other comparable systems and institutions. This part also discusses State University and University of California policies regarding outside income and employment of these executives compared to the policies employed by comparative systems and institutions as well as the procedures used by the segments to establish and maintain executive compensation. Like previous supplemental reports, it also compares the salaries of selected campus-based administrators at the University and the State University with those at comparison-institution campuses and reviews the salaries paid to community college executives in California.

This report is designed to provide only descriptive data and, as a consequence, offers neither policy conclusions nor recommendations.

The Commission approved this report on recommendation of its Policy Development Committee at its meeting on September 16, 1991. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Publications Office of the Commission at (916) 324-4991. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Murray J. Haberman of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8001.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1990-91

A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Supplemental Language to the 1979, 1981, and 1990 Budget Acts

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 91-14
PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1991

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 91-14 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Executive Summary 1

1. Community College Faculty Salaries 3

- History of Community College Faculty Salary Reports 3
- Average Salaries 3
- High- and Low-Paying Districts 5
- Cost-of-Living Adjustments 5
- Salary Schedule Categories 5
- Part-Time Faculty and Full-Time Faculty with Overload Assignments 5
- Summary of the Data 11
- Implications of the Data 12
- Part-Time Faculty and AB 1725 15

2. Compensation of Administrators at the State's Public Colleges and Universities 17

- History of Commission Activities on Administrator Salaries 17
- Executive Compensation at the California State University 21
  - Background 21
  - Chancellor 21
  - Vice Chancellor Positions 26
  - Executive Vice Chancellor 26
  - Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs 26
  - Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs 28
  - Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations 28
  - Vice Chancellor, University Affairs 29
  - General Counsel 29

Salaries and Benefits of Campus Presidents 30
Salaries of Selected State University Campus-Based Administrators 33
Executive Compensation at the University of California 35
Background 35
President 38
Vice President Positions 40
Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs 41
Senior Vice President -- Administration 42
Vice President -- Budget and University Relations 42
Vice President -- Health Affairs 43
Benefits Provided to Executives 43
Campus Chancellors 44
Proportion of Executive Salaries Funded by Sources Other than the State General Fund 44
Selected University of California 45
Salaries Paid to Community College Executives 47
District Superintendents 47
Campus Presidents 47
Chancellor's Office Executives 47

Appendices

A Letter from Kenneth B. O'Brien to Gerald Hayward, August 9, 1979 53

B. Selected Policies of California State University Comparison Institutions 57

C. Selected Policies of University of California Comparison Institutions 59

References 63

Displays

1. Mean Full-Time Credit Contract Faculty Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1990-91 4

2. The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Fall 1985 to Fall 1990 6

3. The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Fall 1985 to Fall 1990 7

4. Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Fall 1985 to Fall 1990 8

5. Annualized Cost-of-Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, by District, 1988-89 to 1990-91 9-10

6. College of the Siskiyous Community College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1989-90 11

7. San Jose/Evergreen Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule, 1989-90 12

8. Saddleback Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule Effective July 1, 1990 13

9. Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1988 to Fall 1990 14

10. Systems and Institutions Used for Comparison with the California State University for the Study of Executive Compensation, 1991 22

11. The California State University's Comparative Rank to Other Systems, 1991 22

12. Comparison of Compensation of the Chancellor of the California State University and the Mean and Median Compensation Paid to the Chief Executive of Selected Comparison Systems, and Selected Characteristics of the Systems, 1991 23

13. Benefits Provided to Chief Executive Officers of Comparison Systems, Compared to the California State University, 1991 24

14. Percent of Comparison Institutions and Systems Providing Perquisites to Their Executive Officers, and Perquisites Provided to Executive Officers of the California State University, 1990-91 25

15. Salary, Benefits, and Total Compensation of State University Vice Chancellors Compared with Similar Positions at Comparison Systems 27

16. Groups of Campuses Used for Comparison with State University Campuses by Size for Analyzing the Salaries of California State University Campus Presidents 31

17. Comparison of Salary and Benefits for Campus Presidents at the California State University and Selected Institutions, 1990-91 32

18. Selected Campus-Based Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1990-91 34

19. Systems and Institutions Used for Comparison with the University of California for the Commission's Study of Executive Compensation 35

20. University of California's Comparative Rank to Other Systems and Campuses, 1991 36

21. Size and Scope of the University of California and Other Comparable Systems and Campuses, 1991 37

22. Comparison of Salary Compensation of the President of the University of California and the Mean and Median Salary Compensation Paid to the Chief Executive of Selected Comparison Campuses and Systems, with Selected Institutional Characteristics 39

23. Comparison of Salary Compensation of the President of the University of California and the Mean and Median Salary Compensation Paid to the Chief Executive Officer of Selected Comparison Systems, with Selected System Characteristics 39

24. Benefits and Perquisites Provided to University of California Executives in Comparison to Those Provided by Comparable Institutions, 1991 40

25. Comparison of Salary Compensation for University Senior Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents, and the Mean and Median Salary Compensation Paid to Similar Executives of Selected Comparison Institutions and Systems 41

26. Cost of Fringe Benefits as a Percent of Payroll, University of California, 1991 43

27. Comparison of Salary and Deferred Costs for Chancellors at the University of California and Selected Institutions, with Number of Personnel, 1990-91 45

28. Actual Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California, 1990-91, Range of Increase Over 1989-90, and Percent of Salary Funded by the State's General Fund 45

29. Annual Year-End Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1990-91 46

30. Salaries of California Community College District Superintendents, Fall 1990 48

31. Salaries of California Community College Presidents, Fall 1990 49-50

32. Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the California Community College Chancellor's Office, 1989-90 and 1990-91 51

Executive Summary

This report consists of two independent sections:

1. Community college faculty salaries

Part One of the report responds to Supplemental Language to the 1979 Budget Act, which directed the Commission to prepare annual reports on the salaries of California Community College faculty members. It presents an overview of those salaries and estimates the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at $49,268. It indicates that the difference in mean salaries between the ten highest-paying and the ten lowest-paying of the 71 districts that reported data to the State is about 20 percent. It also displays cost-of-living percent increases for each of the districts. Finally, it shows that on a statewide basis, full-time faculty salaries are nearly twice as high per weekly faculty contact hour as part-time faculty and about 64 percent more than overload faculty. If fringe benefits are added, this disparity is even greater.

This year's report also includes a discussion of implications of the community college data and the Commission's role in examining the use of part-time faculty in the colleges.

2. Compensation of administrators at the State's public colleges and universities

Part Two of the report responds to Supplemental Language to the 1990 Budget Act that instructed the Commission to report on the compensation paid to selected executives at the University and State University; and it responds to 1981 Supplemental Language that requires an annual report on the salaries of selected campus-based administrators at these two segments. It provides a complete history of the Commission's work in the area of executive and ad-ministrative compensation and discusses the process used by the Commission in conducting this study.

The California State University

This section of Part Two shows that the salaries, benefits and perquisites that are now provided to the chancellor and vice chancellors at the California State University are very competitive to those paid to similar executives at comparable colleges and universities. It also shows that total compensation packages provided to the presidents of small- and medium-size State University campuses are comparable to those paid to other campus-based chief executives while the total compensation packages provided to presidents of large State University campuses lag behind those provided to comparable large-campus chief executive officers by an average of 16.4 percent.

The report also shows that policies used by the State University's Trustees regarding outside income and employment, and regarding the process for setting salaries are similar to policies established by comparable systems and campuses throughout the nation.

Finally, the report shows the salaries for selected administrative positions at State University campuses in light of comparison-institution data for these campus-based positions.

University of California

This section of Part Two shows that salaries paid to University executives are competitive with those paid to similar executives at other campuses and systems throughout the nation. It also shows that once the University begins to pay its executives deferred cash payments from its Nonqualified Deferred Income Program its position in the marketplace will be very competitive.

Although no benefits data were collected from comparison institutions, the report shows University data which suggest that benefits provided by the system are very competitive and generous. For example, in addition to exceptional health care benefits, the University of California's Retirement System now exceeds actuarial estimates, and because of its high level of capitalization, requires neither employer nor employee contributions.

This section shows that the president, senior vice presidents, and vice presidents at the systemwide level, and the chancellors of the University's nine campuses receive more perquisites and enhanced benefits -- such as supplemental life insurance, supplemental retirement, and supplemental vacation -- than their comparison institution counterparts. It also shows that a portion of the salary paid to several executives is funded through sources other than the State General Fund, while the chancellors' salaries are funded entirely from the State's General Fund.

The section shows that policies used by the Regents regarding outside income and employment, as well as its process for setting salaries, are similar to policies established by other comparable systems and campuses throughout the nation. Finally, like the section on the State University, this portion of the report shows the salaries paid for selected University campus-based positions in comparison to those paid by institutions with similar positions.

California Community Colleges

Pursuant to a Commission request, this section displays data on salaries paid to California Community College district superintendents, campus presidents, and selected executive positions in the system's Chancellor's Office, but no comparison-institution data are available for these positions.

1 *Community College Faculty Salaries*

History of community college faculty salary reports

In February 1979, the Legislative Analyst recommended in the Analysis of the Budget Bill, 1979-80, that the Commission include information on California Community College faculty salaries in its annual faculty salary reports. Responding to this recommendation, the Commission presented data on community college faculty salaries for the 1977-78 fiscal year in its April 1979 report, *Faculty Salaries in California Public Higher Education, 1979-80*, but it was unable to include data for 1978-79 (the then current year) because the Chancellor's Office had abandoned such data collection as part of the cutbacks resulting from the passage of Proposition 13 in June 1978.

Subsequently, Commission staff proposed that the submission of community college faculty salary data be formalized, and beginning with the 1979-80 fiscal year it was. In August 1979, Commission staff outlined for the Chancellor the specific information desired (Appendix A, below) and asked the Chancellor's staff to submit 1978-79 data by November 1, 1979, and subsequent fiscal-year data by March 1 of the year involved.

In 1981-82, the Chancellor's Office initiated the "Staff Data File" -- a computerized data collection system that is now in its tenth year of operation, and that has provided comprehensive reports for the past nine years. During these years, the Chancellor's Office has produced comprehensive and accurate reports that contain information on average salaries and salary ranges; cost-of-living adjustments; teaching loads; numbers of full- and part-time faculty; age, sex, and ethnicity of its faculty; number of new hires, promotions, and separations; and qualifications and schedules for various salary categories.

Despite this substantial improvement in reporting from prior years, two problems remain:

- The first relates to incomplete data, due primarily to protracted collective bargaining negotiations. When negotiations extend into the spring of the current academic year, and cost-of-living adjustments are accordingly allocated retroactively, there is seldom sufficient time to include the increases in the mean salary figures reported. The result is that many of the mean salaries reported are inaccurate. In addition, 35 of the system's 71 districts did not report cost-of-living adjustments for this year.
- The second problem is that complete salary adjustments are not always reported. In 1990-91, for example, one-time "off-schedule" or "add-on" adjustments were granted to faculty in four districts. These analytical differences in computing average salaries are discussed further in the next section.

Average salaries

Display 1 on page 4 shows 1990-91 mean full-time contract faculty salaries as reported by the 71 community college districts. The first footnote in that display indicates that eight districts did not report cost-of-living increases for 1990-91 and consequently could not incorporate such increases into their mean salary figures. As a result, the salaries reported for those districts more nearly approximate 1989-90 salaries. The second footnote includes 35 districts where salary negotiations were complete but which did not have sufficient time to incorporate those increases into their mean salary figures.

In all, Display 1 indicates that accurate current-year data are available for only 28 districts -- 39.4 percent of the 71 possible -- with the faculty employed by those districts representing 37.5 percent of the systemwide total. Accordingly, it is probable that the actual mean salary for the system is higher than the $47,575 reported in the display. To provide an estimate of actual salaries, the mean salaries of the 43 nonreporting districts, were incremented by 6.39 percent -- the average percent increase for the 28 reporting districts -- which result-

DISPLAY 1 Mean Full-Time Credit Contract Faculty Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1990-91

District	Mean Salary	District	Mean Salary
Allan Hancock	$42,400	North Orange[1,2]	$47,529
Antelope Valley	42,838	Palo Verde[1,2]	35,824
Barstow	48,236	Palomar	49,569
Butte[2]	45,390	Pasadena Area	46,807
Cabrillo	44,757	Peralta[2]	41,135
Cerritos[2]	51,166	Rancho Santiago[2]	50,042
Chabot-Las Positas[2]	46,441	Redwoods	44,852
Chaffey	44,246	Rio Hondo	51,139
Citrus	47,617	Riverside	48,680
Coachella Valley (Desert)[2]	43,959	Saddleback	54,559
Coast[2]	46,300	San Bernardino	46,704
Compton[2,3]	40,008	San Diego[2]	44,521
Contra Costa[2]	49,500	San Francisco	48,960
El Camino[2]	49,047	San Joaquin Delta[2]	50,760
Feather River[2]	41,246	San Jose[2]	47,322
Foothill/DeAnza	52,962	San Luis Obispo	43,729
Fremont-Newark	49,137	San Mateo[2]	47,916
Gavilan[2]	46,011	Santa Barbara[2]	42,360
Glendale	48,509	Santa Clarita[2]	47,147
Grossmont[1,2]	48,095	Santa Monica[2]	50,904
Hartnell[2]	43,149	Sequoias[2]	47,286
Imperial[1,2]	41,951	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	45,735
Kern[2]	45,395	Sierra	42,772
Lake Tahoe[2]	41,282	Siskiyous[1,2]	40,204
Lassen	43,391	Solano County	49,779
Long Beach	49,859	Sonoma County	49,518
Los Angeles[1,2]	47,794	Southwestern	49,764
Los Rios[1,2]	46,566	State Center	46,522
Marin[2]	48,807	Ventura County[2]	48,570
Mendocino	42,411	Victor Valley	41,376
Merced	48,212	West Hills[1]	42,990
Mira Costa	46,677	West Kern[2]	48,956
Monterey Peninsula[2]	44,307	West Valley	49,973
Mt. San Antonio[2]	47,541	Yosemite	52,667
Mt. San Jacinto	43,055	Yuba	49,360
Napa[3]	45,211	**Systemwide Average[4]**	47,575

1. These eight districts were still in the process of salary negotiations for 1990-91 at the time mean salary data were reported. Consequently, the salaries reported more closely approximate the 1989-90 mean.
2. Although salary negotiations in these 35 districts were complete as of the Chancellor's Office deadline for reporting data, mean salary data do not reflect the 1990-91 cost-of-living adjustment. Consequently, the salaries reported may more closely approximate the 1989-90 mean.
3. No cost-of-living adjustments were given at Compton and Napa; rather entire salary schedules were reconstructed, with varying changes for each step.
4. Weighted by total faculty in each district. Credit faculty only.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

ed in a systemwide mean salary of $49,268. There is no way of knowing how accurate that figure may be, but it is probably closer to reality than the $47,575 in Display 1.

High- and low-paying districts

Displays 2 and 3 on pages 6 and 7 show mean salaries as reported in the Staff Data File for regular and contract faculty in the ten highest- and ten lowest-paying districts for selected years between Fall 1988 and Fall 1990, and the systemwide means for each of those years. In each case, those districts reporting incomplete mean salary data are indicated. Display 4 on page 8 shows mean salaries for those districts as a group, the percentage difference between them, and their total number of faculty.

In 1990-91, the highest-paying district was Saddleback with a mean of $54,559. The lowest-paying was Palo Verde with a mean of $35,824 -- although it should be noted that Palo Verde's faculty number only 15 and many of these appear to be newer hires. Among those districts that had finalized negotiations, the difference between Palo Verde and Saddleback was 52.3 percent.

From Display 2 it can be seen that those districts with higher salaries tend to be the larger districts and also tend to be those reporting complete data. Excluded from these displays are salaries paid to non-credit faculty employed by the San Diego and San Francisco districts. Faculty working in these evening programs tend to be paid about one-fourth less than regular faculty at the main campus, and their inclusion consequently would reduce those districtwide averages. Were they to be included, the differences between the highest- and lowest-paying districts, as shown in Display 4, would be even greater, thus highlighting the size factor even more.

Taken as groups of the ten highest and ten lowest, the difference is 24.1 percent, but considering that six of the ten lowest-paying but only four of the ten highest-paying districts reported incomplete data, the true difference between these two groups is probably closer to 20 percent, suggesting a significant narrowing in the gap between the highest- and lowest-paying districts -- an amount that was estimated at approximately 25 percent just a year ago.

Cost-of-living adjustments

Display 5 on pages 9 and 10 provides cost-of-living-adjustment data, by district, for the current and previous two years, weighted by the size of faculty in each district. Based on these weighted data, the systemwide cost-of-living increases averaged 5.73 percent in 1988-89, 6.65 percent in 1989-90, and 6.39 percent in 1990-91. Each year Commission staff update previous year data to reflect actual cost-of-living increases.

Salary schedule categories

The salary schedules of the 71 districts generally provide a number of salary categories or classes through which faculty members can advance depending on educational qualifications, and another series of steps that provide salary increases based on longevity. Typical schedules are reproduced as Displays 6, 7, and 8 on pages 11, 12, and 13 and show the marked differences that exist between low-, medium-, and high-paying districts.

As with mean salaries, these schedules vary greatly from district to district, with some districts offering only one salary classification based on educational achievement, while others offer as many as nine. In addition, some districts have as few as 12 anniversary increments, while others have 30 or more. In some cases, additional stipends are provided to doctoral degree holders, department chairmen, and others with special qualifications or responsibilities.

Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments

For many years, the community colleges have employed a large number of part-time or temporary faculty, and most districts have also permitted full-time regular and contract faculty to work additional hours or overloads. Display 9 on page 14 shows sev-

DISPLAY 2 The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Fall 1985 to Fall 1990

	Ten Highest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
Year:	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989[3]	1990[4]
Number of Districts:	70	69	68	68	69	71
Saddleback	42,083	41,815	46,335	48,413	47,978	$54,559
Foothill/DeAnza	$41,547	41,711	43,466	45,363	50,499	52,962
Yosemite						52,667
Cerritos[1]	39,258	41,746	44,097	46,009	47,835	51,166
Rio Hondo		40,481	43,602	45,299		
Santa Monica[1]	39,809	41,334				50,904
San Joaquin Delta[1]	41,562	44,029	45,923	46,311	48,243	50,760
Rancho Santiago[1]					47,654	50,042
West Valley						49,973
Long Beach	39,547	42,326				49,859
Marin			45,013	46,753	49,246	
West Kern	38,975	41,934	44,201	45,916	48,291	
Sequoias				45,074	48,020	
Ventura					47,522	
Citrus					47,418	
Contra Costa	39,047	43,998	43,979	47,661		
San Mateo				45,323		
Southwestern			42,764		48,020	
Mt. San Antonio	38,417	40,632	42,685			
Desert	39,211					
Statewide Mean Salary[2]	**$36,203**	**$38,005**	**$40,046**	**$42,035**	**$44,286**	**$47,575**

1. Annualized 1990-91 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.
2. Weighted by total faculty in each district.
3. Includes both credit and non-credit instructional faculty.
4. Includes only credit instructional faculty.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

eral comparisons between full-time, part-time, and overload faculty between Fall 1988 and Fall 1990. For example, it shows the number of full-time faculty with and without overload assignments compared to the number of part-time faculty. It also shows workload in terms of weekly faculty contact hours (WFCH) -- the actual number of hours faculty spend in classrooms. Comparing these two, it can be seen that, while the number of part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty by more than two-to-one, they teach only 38.8 percent of these contact hours. Regular and contract faculty teach 54.6 percent on regular assignments, with those teaching overloads accounting for the remaining 6.5 percent. Regular and contract faculty on regular assignments averaged 16.1 weekly faculty contact hours

DISPLAY 3 The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Fall 1985 to Fall 1990

	Ten Lowest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts					
Year:	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989[3]	1990[4]
Number of Districts:	70	69	68	69	69	71
Palo Verde	$30,930		$34,505	$35,731	$39,411	$35,824
Compton[1]	30,632	$30,929	34,475	35,268	34,464	40,008
Siskiyous[1]			34,843	36,524	38,330	40,204
Peralta[1]			36,275	37,432		41,135
Feather River[1]					35,968	41,246
Lake Tahoe[1]				38,125		41,246
Victor Valley	31,967	34,061			38,831	41,376
Imperial[1]	30,900	32,090	32,642	35,233	38,312	41,951
Santa Barbara[1]		34,794				42,360
Allan Hancock		33,962				42,400
Chaffey					31,742	
Cabrillo	32,264	32,960	33,768	35,286	38,560	
San Diego					38,734	
Mendocino			36,460	36,791	39,490	
Napa	31,442	33,099	33,581	35,453		
Mount San Jacinto				37,699		
West Hills			36,346			
Lassen	32,308	32,856				
Monterey Peninsula		34,385				
Gavilan	32,234					
Antelope Valley	32,341					
Statewide Mean Salary[2]	**$36,203**	**$38,005**	**$40,046**	**$42,035**	**$44,286**	**$47,575**

1. Annualized 1990-91 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported.
2. Weighted by total faculty in each district.
3. Includes both credit and non-credit instructional faculty.
4. Includes only credit instructional faculty.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

in 1990-91, while part-time faculty averaged 5.5 hours, and those teaching any overload averaged 4.7 additional hours. About 40.5 percent of full-time regular and contract faculty members teach some overload. Most noteworthy among these numbers is the fact that pursuant to legislative directive, the number of full-time faculty has markedly outpaced the growth in the number of part-time faculty, while at the same time the number of regular faculty teaching overload increased by 6.3 percent.

Compensation comparisons between full-time and part-time faculty are difficult, since full-time faculty have responsibilities other than classroom teaching, while part-time faculty generally do not. Full-

DISPLAY 4 Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Fall 1985 to Fall 1990

Item	Fall 1985	Fall 1986	Fall 1987	Fall 1988	Fall 1989	Fall 1990
Mean Salaries:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$40,059	$42,144	$44,137	$46,304	$48,503	$51,496
Unweighted	39,946	42,001	44,207	46,212	48,271	51,403
Ten Lowest Paying Districts						
Weighted[1]	$31,547	$32,515	$34,454	$36,399	$37,411	$41,499
Unweighted	31,619	32,422	34,600	36,354	37,384	40,990
Percent by Which the Ten Highest Paying Districts Exceed the Ten Lowest Paying Districts (Weighted Means):	27.0%	29.6%	28.1%	27.2%	29.6%	24.09%
Systemwide Mean Salary (69 Districts)[1]	$36,203	$38,005	$40,046	$42,035	$44,268	$47,575
Number of Regular Faculty:						
Ten Highest Paying Districts	2,044	2,182	2,022	2,121	2,012	2,537
Ten Lowest Paying Districts	974	1,341	1,205	833	1,083	923
Percent Higher Paying Districts Exceed Lower Paying Districts (Total Faculty)	109.9%	62.7%	67.8%	154.6%	85.8%	174.9%

1. Weighted by total full-time credit faculty in each reporting district.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

time faculty spend time in counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service. Preparation for classroom teaching, however, necessarily occupies a considerable amount of time for both full-time and part-time faculty. The exact proportion of total workload devoted to activities not directly related to classroom teaching is not known, but an assumption used recently by the Chancellor's Office (1987, p. 7) is that three-fourths is instructionally related (teaching and preparation) with the remaining one-fourth devoted to other campus activities. With this factor, although not a precise measure, it is possible to present a general comparison.

The Chancellor's Office publishes hourly rates for part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments, and these systemwide data are shown in Item 5 in Display 9, which indicates that overload faculty are currently paid 16.6 percent more than part-time faculty.

Items 7 and 8 in Display 9 compare the estimate of compensation per weekly faculty contact hour for full-time faculty with the actual data reported for part-time and overload faculty. Also on a systemwide basis, these comparisons show full-time faculty in 1990-91 earning nearly twice as much (91.5 percent) per weekly faculty contact hour in salary as part-time faculty, and 64.2 percent more than the amount paid for overload assignments. If fringe

DISPLAY 5 Annualized Cost-of-Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1988-89 to 1990-91

District	Number of Regular and Contract Full-Time Faculty 1990-91	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1988-89	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1989-90	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1990-91
Allan Hancock	110	4.07%	6.40%	4.50
Antelope Valley	96	5.12	6.50	8.00
Barstow	23	0.00	6.00	5.00
Butte	126	5.23	6.37	7.00
Cabrillo	148	5.25	7.00	6.00
Cerritos	219	5.70	6.40	5.66
Chabot-Las Positas	227	6.30	6.00	3.00
Chaffey	152	8.50	5.00	10.00
Citrus	123	4.00	6.37	4.40
Coachella	101	6.50	10.00	4.00
Coast	564	7.01	3.65	8.61
Compton	68	7.00	*1	N/R
Contra Costa	404	4.70	7.00	6.50
El Camino	286	5.35	5.50	4.65
Feather River	18	*1	0.00	11.00
Foothill	407	5.00	7.00	6.70
Fremont-Newark	94	4.50	7.00	5.66
Gavilan	61	5.00	5.00	5.50
Glendale	171	8.00	5.64	5.66
Grossmont	223	6.00	14.00	*
Hartnell	72	4.00	5.50	6.00
Imperial	74	9.00	10.00	*
Kern	263	5.00	4.00	5.00
Lake Tahoe	19	5.80	3.00	5.00
Lassen	42	5.00	5.00	4.66
Long Beach	273	4.35	5.00	5.50
Los Angeles	1,569	6.00	8.00	*
Los Rios	601	9.30	6.08	*
Marin	131	6.10	0.00	11.75
Mendocino	39	6.00	7.46	5.66
Merced	13	6.20	5.00	5.60
MiraCosta	81	4.50	11.50	6.40
Monterey Peninsula	104	6.50	9.00	5.50
Mt. San Antonio	273	5.00	5.00	6.00
Mt. San Jacinto	49	5.25	4.64	8.00
Napa	89	9.50	N/R	7.00
North Orange	443	1.00	7.50	*
Palo Verde	15	6.00	6.00	*
Palomar	230	7.32	6.00	5.70
Pasadena Area	308	4.12	7.00	5.00

(continued)

DISPLAY 5, Continued

District	Number of Regular and Contract Full-Time Faculty 1990-91	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1988-89	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1989-90	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1990-91
Peralta	307	3.00%	4.00%	10.00%
Rancho Santiago	282	2.40	5.50	5.50
Redwoods	99	4.93	5.98	5.98
Rio Hondo	168	4.70	5.00	5.00
Riverside	198	6.00	6.50	6.50
Saddleback	273	6.70	6.14	4.66
San Bernardino	187	*	6.20	5.00
San Diego	410[2]	7.00	9.40	7.00
San Francisco	365[2]	7.00	7.00	7.40
San Joaquin Delta	212	4.90	5.10	6.00
San Jose	203	4.75	7.00	5.50
San Luis Obispo	91	6.88	4.43	5.84
San Mateo	344	6.00	7.50	6.50
Santa Barbara	181	5.74	8.00	6.67
Santa Clarita	55	6.00	6.00	5.00
Santa Monica	226	6.00	6.90	6.66
Sequoias	136	5.30	5.50	*
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	122	3.50	8.00	8.50
Sierra	126	4.00	6.00	7.30
Siskiyous	44	5.00	3.76	5.18
Solano County	132	8.00	8.00	7.00
Sonoma County	231	4.70	6.00	8.00
Southwestern	170	5.00	6.00	6.00
State Center	289	6.75	6.39	6.95
Ventura County	389	7.00	8.00	8.00
Victor Valley	64	5.00	9.30	6.00
West Hills	47	5.30	5.50	*
West Kern	21	5.00	5.00	10.00
West Valley	264	5.05	9.00	4.50
Yosemite	213	4.80	7.00	5.00
Yuba	112	5.75	5.75	5.00
Number of Districts Reporting		68	70	62
Total/Mean -- Based on Reporting Districts		5.73%	6.65%	6.39%

1. Compton Community College District did not report data to the Chancellor's Office in 1989-90, and Feather River did not report data in 1988-89.

2. Credit faculty only.

* These eight districts in 1990-91 were still in salary negotiations at the Chancellor's Office deadline for submitting data.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

DISPLAY 6 College of the Siskiyous Community College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1989-90

Step	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1	$23,101	$24,148	$25,194	$26,244	$27,291	$29,022
2	23,935	25,040	26,136	27,240	28,343	30,139
3	24,777	25,929	27,084	28,236	29,391	31,255
4	25,618	26,821	28,031	29,233	30,439	32,368
5	26,456	27,710	28,972	30,227	31,490	33,488
6	27,291	28,604	29,916	31,226	32,535	34,598
7	28,133	29,496	30,859	32,221	33,585	35,714
8	28,972	30,385	31,805	33,218	34,634	36,830
9		31,276	32,746	34,215	35,686	37,949
10		32,171	33,689	35,211	36,731	39,060
11		33,061	34,634	36,201	37,781	40,176
12		33,951	35,579	37,205	38,827	41,289
13				38,198	39,878	42,406
14					40,927	43,521
17					41,973	44,634
20					43,023	45,752
23					44,074	46,867
26					45,121	47,982

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

benefits are added, these percentages would be even higher.

Summary of the data

In the current year, regular and contract faculty for which complete data exist earned an average salary of $47,575 -- an amount that is probably understated by 3 to 4 percent, since only 28 districts submitted complete data in time for inclusion in the Chancellor's Office report. Thirty-five other districts reported the percentage amount of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) but could not include the increase in their mean salary figures. In addition to these 35, eight districts were still in the process of negotiating current-year increases and thus could not report a cost-of-living adjustment figure. Most of the nine districts reporting no cost-of-living adjustment, primarily because of protracted collective bargaining decisions, are likely to approve some increase in salary for their faculty.

For the 63 districts that did report cost-of-living adjustment data, the average increase for 1990-91 was 6.39 percent after mid-year adjustments are included. This compares to a comparable figure of about 6.65 percent in 1989-90. These last two years, community college faculty have averaged increases greater than the rate of inflation, and many attribute their cost-of-living increases to Proposition 98 (1988) that guaranteed community college districts a fixed proportion of the State's General Fund Budget.

Part-time faculty continue to be paid about half the amount paid to full-time faculty on a per-contact-hour basis, and the difference between them has increased slightly over the past three years. The number of part-time faculty employed has increased by 18.5 percent since 1988 -- from 26,031 to 30,843. The relative share of contact hours taught by full-

DISPLAY 7 San Jose/Evergreen Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule, 1989-90

Step	Class I BA	Class II MA	Class III BA +45 Units with MA	Class IV BA +60 Units with MA	Class V BA +81 Units with MA	Class VI Doctorate
		Temporary Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area	Permanent Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area	Permanent Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area Plus 25 Units	Permanent Community College Credential in Specified[1] Vocational Area Plus 50 Units with BA	Doctorate
1	$24,349	$27,208	$28,502	$29,801	$31,094	$31,912
2	25,365	28,394	29,728	31,137	32,565	33,384
3	26,377	29,582	30,945	32,469	34,028	34,848
4	27,389	30,765	32,171	33,808	35,497	36,317
5	28,401	31,948	33,386	35,144	36,964	37,785
6	29,407	33,135	34,607	36,480	38,433	39,250
7	30,568	34,317	35,830	37,818	39,901	40,721
8	31,580	35,503	37,048	39,153	41,369	42,190
9[2]	32,592	36,686	38,271	40,490	42,834	43,654
10	33,604	37,872	39,495	41,826	44,303	45,123
11	34,616	39,058	40,711	43,164	45,766	46,587
12	34,616	40,241	41,934	44,500	47,237	48,055
13	34,616	41,424	43,154	45,832	48,704	49,524
14	34,616	41,424	43,154	45,832	48,704	49,524
15	34,616	41,424	43,154	45,832	48,704	49,524
16	34,616	42,608	44,377	47,173	50,173	50,992
19[3]				48,511	51,641	52,460
22[3]					53,109	53,928

1. Vocational fields specified by the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District.
2. Maximum beginning step placement for years of experience.
3. Requires Professional Recognition plan approved by Professional Recognition Committee, longevity, and completion of nine semester units.

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

time, part-time, and overload faculty has declined slightly over the last year.

The lack of complete mean salary data continues to be a problem with the Chancellor's Office Staff Data File, one that is probably unsolvable given the length of many collective bargaining negotiations and the early fall deadline for the Chancellor's Office report. For this reason, the data appearing in this part of the report should be viewed with caution.

Implications of the data

A major challenge facing the California Community Colleges through the year 2000 will be the recruitment of a large number of new faculty. Current Chancellor's Office estimates suggest that some 20,000 new hires will be needed during the next 10 to 15 years in response to anticipated enrollment growth, expectations for as many as 22 new campuses and to replace those who will leave the system through retirement or normal attrition (at present,

DISPLAY 8 Saddleback Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule Effective July 1, 1990

Step	I	II	III	IV	V
1	$27,173	$29,211	$31,249	$33,287	$35,325
2	28,532	30,570	32,608	34,646	36,684
3	29,891	31,929	33,967	36,005	38,043
4	31,249	33,287	35,325	37,363	39,401
5	32,608	34,646	36,684	38,722	40,760
6	33,967	36,005	38,043	40,081	42,119
7	35,325	37,363	39,401	41,439	43,477
8	36,684	38,722	40,760	42,798	44,836
9	38,043	40,081	42,119	44,157	46,195
10	39,401	41,439	43,477	45,515	47,553
11		42,798	44,836	46,874	48,912
12		44,157	46,195	48,233	50,271
13		45,515	47,553	49,591	51,629
14		46,874	48,912	50,950	52,988
15		48,233	50,271	52,309	54,347
16			51,629	53,667	55,705
17			52,988	55,026	57,064
18			54,347	56,385	58,422
19			55,705	57,743	59,781
20			57,064	59,102	61,140
21				60,460	62,498
22				61,819	63,857
23				63,178	65,216
24				64,536	66,574
25				65,895	67,933
30					74,728

Source: Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

the average age of full-time community college faculty members is about 49 years). The number of part-time faculty members, and their proper role in community college staffing, will also present a key issue regarding faculty quality during this time.

The data on community college faculty compensation presented in this section of the report reveal several conditions with major implications for the future:

- First, fiscal constraints will continue to draw into question the provisions of Proposition 98 that guarantee the community colleges a defined proportion of State expenditures.
- The use of part-time faculty is a second issue of concern. The number of these faculty has increased by over 18 percent in the last three years alone, and they continue to represent a major part of campus teaching loads. While major inroads appear to have taken place during the last year in the hiring of full-time faculty, fiscal pressures will continue to force many districts to lim-

DISPLAY 9 *Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1988 to Fall 1990*

Item	Fall 1988	Fall 1989	Fall 1990
1. Number of Faculty Members:			
Full-Time Faculty[1]	8,124	8,445	8,923
Part-Time Faculty	26,031	28,606	30,843
Overload Faculty	5,490	5,703	6,063
2. Total WFCH Taught:			
Full-Time Faculty	229,829	234,249	239,016
Part-Time Faculty	139,484	158,016	169,849
Overload Faculty	25,877	27,843	28,533
3. Percentage Distribution of WFCH Taught:			
Full-Time Faculty	58.2%	55.8%	54.6%
Part-Time Faculty	35.3	37.6	38.8
Overload Faculty	6.5	6.6	6.5
4. Mean WFCH Taught:			
Full-Time Faculty[2]	16.9	16.3	16.1
Part-Time Faculty	5.4	5.6	5.5
Overload Faculty	4.7	4.9	4.7
5. Mean Dollars Paid per WFCH:			
Part-Time Faculty	$28.38	$29.68	$31.79
Overload Faculty	33.22	35.04	37.06
6. Compensation of Overload Faculty as a Percentage of Part-Time Faculty:	117.1%	118.1%	116.6%
7. Mean Dollars Paid to Contract and Regular Faculty per WFCH, Assuming No Overload Assignments:[3]			
Unadjusted	$71.14	$75.42	$81.15
Adjusted[4]	53.36	56.57	60.87
8. Compensation of Full-Time Faculty (Adjusted in Item 7) as a Percentage of Part-Time and Overload Faculty per WFCH:			
Part-Time Faculty	188.0%	190.6%	191.5%
Overload Faculty	160.6	161.4	164.2

1. No overload.

2. Full-time faculty teaching regular assignments only.

3. Based on a 35-week year.

4. Dollar amount reduced by 25 percent to reflect additional responsibilities of regular and contract faculty such as counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office.

it the hiring of the more expensive full-time regular contract faculty.

Part-time faculty and AB 1725

Colleges make temporary faculty appointments for a variety of reasons: to fill definable needs within a department, such as the replacement of regular faculty who have other assignments either on or off campus; to replace retired faculty; to fill full-time positions because of the lack of qualified applicants; to perform specialized functions such as teaching remedial or basic courses; to fill positions when tenured or tenure tract faculty are not available; and to meet the need for special or unique expertise. In addition, today's community college students are older, more frequently part time, and often employed full time. Many institutions have responded to these students by developing extensive evening class schedules and hiring part-time faculty to teach them.

There is general agreement that the community colleges need temporary faculty in order to respond to these staffing challenges and to provide certain courses that require special expertise. Yet the college administrators may have become increasingly dependent upon the use of part-time faculty not only to meet the special needs of students but also as a means of balancing their budgets.

In 1988, the Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 1725 (Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988), part of which requires the community colleges to address by 1992 "a long-standing policy of the Board of Governors that at least 75 percent of the hours of credit instruction in the California Community Colleges as a system should be taught by full-time instructors." In the past, part-time appointments may have been justified by budget limitations. The well-known "freeway flyer" -- the part-time faculty person who often commutes dozens of miles between campuses or even districts -- receives no fringe benefits and is compensated with only about half the salary of full-time faculty members. Again, because of severe budget shortfalls, community college districts may again turn to the less expensive part-timer to assure balanced budgets. This comes at a time when these same districts are attempting to respond to legislation requiring them to increase full-time instruction.

Last year, the Commission reviewed a prospectus that addressed the implications of using part-time and irregular ranks faculty. That prospectus raised many questions regarding the adequacy of current State policies pertaining to the use of these faculty. At present, the Commission is proceeding with its examination of part-time and irregular ranks faculty at each of the State's three public systems of higher education; the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges. Data submitted by the University and State University are currently being analyzed; Commission staff continue to work with the community colleges to provide comprehensive information.

Depending upon current and projected resources, Commission staff will continue to examine the voluminous data submitted by the segments and expect to present a preliminary report on the topic this fall.

2 *Compensation of Administrators at the State's Public Colleges and Universities*

History of Commission activities on administrator salaries

During the 1981 Legislative Session, the Legislature adopted the following Supplemental Language to the Budget Bill:

> It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Postsecondary Education Commission include in its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefits comparative information on salaries of administrators within the University of California and the California State University.

Since 1981-82, the University and the State University have collected data from their comparison institutions and forwarded them to the Commission for analysis; the Commission has then included them in its reports. In this way, it has become possible to present a comparison between California's public institutions and those in the rest of the nation for a representative sample of administrative positions.

For several years, consensus was lacking about which positions should be surveyed, which comparisons were valid, and which comparison institutions would provide the most useful data. Initially in 1981-82, a list of 25 administrative titles was selected from the list of 130 position descriptions developed by the College and University Personnel Association, and this number was reduced to as few as 15 in 1983-84. In 1986, the Commission's Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology discussed the issue of administrators' salaries, compiled a list that should remain constant for the foreseeable future and that included 18 campus-based positions at both the University of California and the California State University, plus 12 and 10 positions from the respective central offices on that list. It also agreed that the same group of comparison institutions used for faculty analyses should be used for administrators, but only for the campus-based positions rather than central office positions. Based on these agreements, the Commission has published five annual reports on these selected administrative positions since 1986.

1990-91 Supplemental Budget Language regarding executive compensation

This year's report has been altered significantly from previous reports because of special Supplemental Budget Language to the 1990-91 Budget Act. Although this report continues to analyze salary differentials for selected campus-based administrator positions, it also presents a special comprehensive analysis of the total compensation (salary, fringe benefits, and perquisites) provided to high-level executive positions at the California State University and the University of California.

The impetus for this special study was a legislative concern that no systematic methodologies existed for establishing appropriate levels of executive compensation for either the California State University or the University of California. The Legislature thus adopted budget language that requests information regarding the "total compensation" paid to campus and systemwide executives by institutions and systems comparable to the University and State University, in order to better understand these compensation levels and how they are determined by other states.

Specifically, the 1990-91 Supplemental Language directed the Commission as follows:

1. *Top-Level Administrator Salary Comparisons*

   It is the intent of the Legislature that CPEC include in its annual report to the Legislature on administrator salaries information about the total compensation paid to UC and CSU top-level administrators (President/Chancellor, Senior Vice Presidents, Vice Presidents, Executive Vice Chancellor, and Vice Chancellors) in comparison to the total compensation paid to comparable administrators at comparable pub-

lic and private universities. In a process similar to that used to develop a salary comparison group for faculty salaries, the CPEC shall consult with UC, CSU, the Legislative Analyst, and the Department of Finance in determining comparison universities for this top-level salary comparison. This report shall include a discussion of policies concerning outside income.

For the first year of this report, CPEC shall also report on the job responsibilities of the top-level systemwide administrators within UC and CSU in comparison to the job responsibilities of UC and CSU campus presidents/chancellors. (CPEC's current administrator report requirement includes campus chancellor/president salary levels in comparison to other comparable universities.)

2. *Description of the Process Used by Other States in Setting Top-Level Administrator Salaries*

The CPEC shall report in its next administrator salary report on the process used to determine top-level administrator (President/Chancellor, Senior Vice Presidents, Vice Presidents, Executive Vice Chancellor, and Vice Chancellors) and campus Chancellor/President compensation by other states with institutions comparable to UC and CSU.

The Commission was not asked to recommend a level or amount appropriate for executive compensation.

Special note concerning comparison methodologies, policies, and responsibilities for determining executive compensation

The Commission recognizes several concerns raised by the University of California and the California State University regarding the usefulness of comparison institution methodologies for reviewing executive compensation in higher education. Part of the concern is a technical one of arriving at a methodology and group of comparison institutions that can be agreed to by the segments and by other interested parties, such as the Commission, the Legislature, and the Department of Finance. A larger issue, however, is a policy concern as to whether executive salary comparisons should be used at the State level in the review of institutional budgets.

Executive compensation is somewhat different than faculty compensation: the recruitment pools are different, the promotion patterns are different, and the overall career paths are different. Even among comparable institutions, differences exist about how responsibilities are distributed and the level of policy involvement among various executives that can make position-to-position comparisons difficult. Furthermore, over-reliance on formulae for such matters tends to flatten all salaries at some level (whether high or low) among so-called "comparable" positions, when merit, performance, and institutional flexibility should be more dominant considerations.

The Commission recognizes that it is appropriate for the Legislature and Executive Branch to request data based on various comparison institution methodologies as part of their review of executive compensation in institutional budgets. However, the Commission believes that the responsibility and concomitant flexibility for setting appropriate policies and levels of compensation for executives should remain with the individual governing boards.

Process used for conducting the study

Pursuant to the legislative directive, Commission staff convened an advisory committee comprised of representatives from the Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, the University of California, and the California State University for the purpose of determining an appropriate study design and methodology for a study of executive compensation. The following advisory committee members conferred on this topic:

Ms. Sharmette Bonpua, Program Analyst
Office of the Legislative Analyst

Judy Day, Principal Budget Analyst, Education Systems, Department of Finance

Harold E. Geiogue, Principal Program Analyst
Office of the Legislative Analyst

Stuart Marshall, Program Analyst
Office of the Legislative Analyst

Calvin C. Moore, Associate Vice President
Academic Personnel and Planning
University of California

Caesar Naples, Vice Chancellor
Faculty and Staff Relations
The California State University

Ellen Switkes, Director of Academic Personnel
Office of the President, University of California

During initial consultations with representatives of the State University and University, and prior to the first meeting of the advisory committee, Commission staff were informed that the Trustees of the State University and the Regents of the University had each entered into contracts with a private consulting company in order to review executive compensation for their respective segments. Coincidentally, the Trustees and Regents contracted with the same private consultant -- Towers Perrin -- for both those studies.

Commission staff asked whether it would be possible to use data compiled by Towers Perrin for purposes related to its study. Staff also suggested that representatives of the Commission's advisory committee be allowed an opportunity to provide input to the consultant regarding the methodology and the selection of comparison institutions and systems that would be used in the analysis. This conference would assure data consistency between the Commission's report and that of the consultant.

Representatives of both the University and State University agreed that Towers Perrin would collect and provide Commission staff with those data that were necessary to conduct its study, and further agreed to allow the Commission's advisory committee to provide input to the consultant regarding the two studies' methodologies, as well as the selection of comparison institutions and systems.

On October 19, 1990, Commission staff convened the first of two advisory committee meetings regarding its study of executive compensation. After a brief discussion regarding the intent and objectives of the supplemental budget language, the advisory committee concentrated its efforts on several issue areas, including:

- How to define total compensation for University and State University executives in comparison to other systemwide and institutional high level executives;
- The methodology for selecting comparison systems and institutions;
- How to define executive job responsibilities;
- The need for policy statements regarding the process used by systems and campuses for setting top-level administrator salaries, benefits, and perquisites;
- Methods for segmental and comparison system data collection; and
- Obtaining information on policies concerning outside income for executives.

The committee also requested a meeting with Towers Perrin, but only after the consultant had developed a preliminary outline and study design for each segment's studies.

On December 12, 1990, the advisory committee held its second meeting, which included representatives of Towers Perrin. In concert with those representatives, the committee discussed several matters that pertained to the Commission's study of executive compensation. Topics discussed at that meeting included:

- The methodology and survey instruments being used by Towers Perrin for conducting the University's and State University's studies;
- The criteria that were used to select comparison systems and institutions;
- A review of proposed comparison systems and institutions; and
- Data elements necessary for the Commission's study.

After a presentation by the Towers Perrin staff, the advisory committee made several suggestions to them regarding the study's methodology and design. In addition, the committee recommended that several comparison institutions be changed for the purpose of institutional comparability. All suggestions that were made by the advisory committee were accepted by the Towers Perrin staff.

Although Towers Perrin had agreed to collect certain data, when it submitted its report, Commission staff determined that information for the University was incomplete and inconsistent with the agreement between the advisory committee and Towers Perrin.

Specifically, Towers Perrin had indicated that it would collect benefits data from the comparison in-

stitutions, but the report did not contain this information. Therefore the Commission's report that follows provides benefits data only for the University and not for its comparison institutions.

Furthermore, Towers Perrin included in its initial analysis of comparison institutions for the University several non-degree granting research institutions, such as the Mayo Clinic and SRI International, that were not part of the original list of comparison institutions agreed to by the advisory committee. Although Towers Perrin indicated to the committee that research organizations such as these may be appropriate comparison organizations for the University of California and that it may use such entities when providing its analysis to the Regents, it agreed not to include these non-degree granting entities in any data it would provide to the Commission. The Commission believes that the inclusion of these research entities tends to skew the University's comparison institution data, and that this is not consistent with the advisory committee's position regarding appropriate comparison institutions -- all of which are colleges and universities.

Because of this inconsistency in the core group of comparison institutions, Commission staff requested that Towers Perrin provide it with a second set of comparison-institution data as agreed to by the advisory committee. **Therefore it is important to note that the analysis for the University of California which follows is NOT comparable to that in the report that Towers Perrin prepared for the Regents.**

The Commission believes that the analysis conducted by Towers Perrin for the Regents is viable and simply uses a different comparison institution methodology than the Commission. The Commission also believes that the list of comparison institutions agreed to by the advisory committee is viable and appropriate for the purpose of the Commission's response to the Supplemental Language for the 1991 Budget.

Executive Compensation at the California State University

Background

In Fall 1990, the Trustees of the California State University requested a study regarding executive compensation in part to fulfill its responsibilities set forth in Section 66609 of the California Education Code that states:

> In establishing and justifying salaries, consideration shall be given to the maintenance of the state university in a competitive position in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel in relation to other educational institutions, private industry, or public jurisdictions which are employing personnel with similar duties and responsibilities.

The Trustees contracted with Towers Perrin to conduct a study concentrated solely on comparisons with institutions similar in function and scope to those of the State University -- primarily those granting degrees through the master's degree level.

The Trustees requested that the consultant's analysis provide information on comparison institution executive salaries, benefits as a percent of salary, deferred compensation plan prevalence, and types of available perquisites. In addition, pursuant to a request from the California Postsecondary Education Commission, staff to the Trustees requested policy information regarding outside income, how executive salaries are set at the time of hire, and how salary increases are calculated.

A copy of the consultant's final report is available upon request. For purposes of its compensation analysis, the Commission has relied solely on data provided in the Towers Perrin report.

Positions under study

The positions selected for the State University's executive compensation analysis are:

Chancellor
Executive Vice Chancellor
Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs
Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations
Vice Chancellor, University Affairs
General Counsel
Campus Presidents

The salaries, benefits, and perquisites for the positions cited above are funded exclusively through the State's General Fund.

Comparison institutions

Comparison institutions were selected after extensive consultation with the Personnel Committee of the Board of Trustees, staff of the Commission, and representatives from the Office of the Legislative Analyst and the Department of Finance. A list of those institutions invited to participate and a final list of participants appears in Display 10 on the opposite page.

Five of the six systems invited to participate in the survey provided information. Within these systems, data were compiled for 41 individual campuses. In addition, 15 single-campus institutions were invited to provide information, but only seven of them participated in the survey.

Size and scope

As shown in Display 11 on the next page, when compared to its comparison group, the State University system ranked between first and third in most size and scope measurements. Only in the category of "dollar value of grant/contract revenues" did the State University rank last, which is consistent with its functional Master Plan mission of being primarily an institution offering baccalaureate and master's degrees, and with little emphasis on attracting large research grants. Major research activities, along with doctoral production, are functions primarily reserved for the University of California.

Chancellor

The State University Chancellor is the chief executive officer of the system and is responsible for the entire system. The position reports directly to the

DISPLAY 10 Systems and Institutions Used for Comparison with the California State University for the Study of Executive Compensation, 1991

Type of Institution	University	Number of Campuses Submitting Data: Included	Data	Declined
Multi-Campus System	City University of New York	x	10	
	State University of New York	x	15	
	State University System of Florida	x	9	
	University of Maryland	x	6	
	University of North Carolina			x
	University of Wisconsin	x	1	
Single Campus	Bowling Green State University			x
	Cleveland State University			x
	Idaho State University	x	1	
	Indiana State University	x	1	
	Memphis State University	x	1	
	Montana State University	x	1	
	Montclair State College	x	1	
	New Mexico State University			x
	Oregon State University			x
	University of Alaska - Anchorage			x
	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs			x
	University of Colorado - Denver	x	1	
	University of Hawaii at Manoa	x	1	
	University of Nevada - Las Vegas			x
	University of Texas - San Antonio			x

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

DISPLAY 11 The California State University's Comparative Rank to Other Systems, 1991

Measure	Rank	Percentile	Measure	Rank	Percentile
System Budget	2	75 - 90	Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment		
Number of Campuses	2	75 - 90	Undergraduate	2	75 - 90
System Employees			Master's/Professional		90+
Headcount	2	75 - 90	Doctoral	--	--
Full Time Equivalents	2	75 - 90	Number of Degrees Awarded		
System Faculty	1	90+	Master's	1	90+
System Non-Faculty Employees	3	50 - 75	Doctorate	--	--
Employees Covered by Labor Agreement(s)	2	75 - 90	Dollar Value of Grant/Contract Revenues	6	≤10
			Dollar Value of Non-Grant/ Contract Revenues	1	90+

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

governing Board of Trustees, of which the Chancellor is a member.

Salary

In comparison to other systems, the Chancellor of the State University was until recently paid between the 25th and 50th percentile. (The Chancellor's salary was recently increased from $149,040 to $175,000 upon the hiring of a new individual.) The salaries paid to the five comparison system heads ranged from $116,115 to $175,000; the State University Chancellor's previous salary lagged the comparison mean by 2.7 percent but is now equal to that of the highest paying comparison system.

As shown in Display 12 below, the Chancellor for the State University has responsibility for administering 20 institutions, compared to 11 to 14 campuses for the other system chief executives. In addition, the State University's Chancellor presides over a student enrollment of 237,621 students, some 34,375 employees, and a faculty numbering 16,443. By far, the State University is the largest system of its kind.

Benefits

Display 13 on the next page shows that all comparison systems provide group life insurance, a medical plan, a dental plan, a long-term disability plan, and a pension plan for their chief executive officer. All systems expect entertainment to be part of the position, yet only three comparison systems provide an entertainment allowance.

Likewise, only three comparison systems provide a vision plan, a short-term disability plan, and a deferred compensation 403(b) salary reduction plan. Two comparison systems have no deferred compensation plan, while one provides an employers contribution deferred compensation 403(b) plan, and one other provides a deferred compensation 457 plan.

The State University provides its Chancellor with all those benefits listed above, except for an employ-

DISPLAY 12 Comparison of Compensation of the Chancellor of the California State University and the Mean and Median Compensation Paid to the Chief Executive of Selected Comparison Systems, and Selected Characteristics of the Systems, 1991

		Number of Comparison Systems	Comparison Systems Median	Comparison Systems Mean	The California State University
Compensation	Salary	5	$157,500	$153,173	$149,040*
	Benefit Value	5	$49,500	43,419	42,327
	Total Compensation	5	$207,000	196,592	191,367
	System Budget in Millions of Dollars	5	$1,456	1,622	2,362
System Characteristic	Number of Campuses	5	12	14	20
	FTE System Employees	5	26,861	23,876	34,375
	FTE System Enrollment				
	Undergraduate	5	125,000	147,636	237,621
	Graduate	5	11,238	17,248	37,889
	Doctoral	4	3,991	3,921	0
	FTE System Faculty	5	7,760	8,878	16,443

* This salary has subsequently been increased to $175,000.

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

DISPLAY 13 Benefits Provided to Chief Executive Officers of Comparison Systems, Compared to the California State University, 1991

Category	Item	Number of Systems	Percent of Systems
Benefits	Group Life Insurance	5	100%
	Medical Plan	5	100
	Dental Plan	5	100
	Vision Plan	3	60
	Short-Term Disability Plan	3	60
	Long-Term Disability Plan	5	100
	Pension Plan	5	100
	Dependent Care Plan	3	60
Deferred Compensation	No Plan	2	40
	403(b) Salary Reduction	3	60
	403(b) Employer Contribution	1	20
	457 Plan	1	20
	Nonqualified Plan		
Entertainment	Entertainment Part of Job	5	100
	Entertainment Allowance Provided	3	60

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

er contribution 403(b) deferred compensation plan and a nonqualified deferred compensation plan.

Based on the State University Chancellor's previous salary of $149,040, in 1990-91 the Chancellor earned $42,327 in benefits, compared to an average $43,419 paid to his counterparts. Comparison systems reported a median 29.0 percent of total compensation for benefits, compared to 28.4 percent for the State University. The recent increase in the Chancellor's salary had a direct impact on the value of the Chancellor's benefit package and now undoubtedly exceeds the $42,327 reported.

Perquisites

Display 14 on the opposite page shows those perquisites provided to comparison institution and system executives. The State University Chancellor receives several perquisites, including the use of an automobile, a car phone, a house, and is eligible for a tenured professorship. In addition the State University provides supplemental life insurance.

Several comparison systems provide club dues, drivers, scholarship aid to dependents, physical examinations, supplemental medical insurance, and/or a supplemental retirement or annuity. The State University provides none of these latter perquisites.

Policies regarding outside income and employment

Each comparison system has specific policies regarding outside income and employment. (A summary of those policies appears in Appendix B below.) In general, outside income and employment are permitted provided those activities do not interfere with the normal assigned responsibilities of the chief executive or cause a conflict of interest. In some cases, time taken away from the job must be charged to annual leave and additional income

DISPLAY 14 *Percent of Comparison Institutions and Systems Providing Perquisites to Their Executive Officers, and Perquisites Provided to Executive Officers of the California State University, 1990-91*

Perquisites	Executive Positions (See Index Below)								FTE Enrollment (Job 8)				The California State University
	Job 1	Job 2	Job 3	Job 4	Job 5	Job 6	Job 7	Job 8*	Below 5,000	5,000-12,000	12,000-20,000	Above 20,000	
Automobile or Allowance	100%	40%	40%	25%	25%	50%	20%	94%	90%	92%	100%	100%	X[1]
Car Phone	80	20	20	0	25	25	20	23	20	19	50	0	X[2]
Club Dues	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	20	8	38	25	
Driver Available	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	70	65	38	25	
Educational Aid to Children	40	20	20	25	0	25	40	19	30	15	13	25	
Employment Contract	20	20	20	25	25	25	60	27	30	19	38	50	
Estate Planning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
House	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	70	88	88	100	X[3]
Housing Allowance	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	100	73	50	50	X[4]
Low-Interest Mortgage Loan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Physical Exam	20	20	20	0	25	25	0	6	0	4	0	50	
Sabbatical	40	40	40	50	50	25	0	63	60	69	63	25	X[5]
Supplemental Life Insurance	60	60	40	25	50	25	0	40	50	38	13	75	X
Supplemental Medical Insurance	40	20	20	0	25	25	0	6	0	4	0	50	
Supplemental Retirement or Annuity	60	40	40	25	50	25	0	54	60	50	50	75	
Supplemental Vacation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Tax Planning or Tax Preparation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Tenured Professorship	80	80	20	25	0	0	40	88	90	88	75	100	X

Index: Job 1 - Chancellor
Job 2 - Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Job 3 - Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs
Job 4 - Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations
Job 5 - Vice Chancellor, General Counsel
Job 6 - Vice Chancellor, University Affairs
Job 7 - Executive Vice Chancellor
Job 8 - Campus Chief Executive Officer

Notes:
1. Only the Chancellor and campus presidents are provided the use of a car.
2. The Chancellor is provided with a car phone, but campus presidents are not.
3. Only the Chancellor and presidents at Chico, Fresno, Fullerton, Pomona, and San Luis Obispo are provided with a house.
4. Only presidents who are not provided the use of a house receive a housing allowance that varies by geographic area.
5. Only presidents are eligible for sabbatical leaves.

* Other perquisites provided for Job 8 by one or more single-campus institutions: Supplemental Professional Leave. Professional Travel. House, including home maintenance, groundskeeping, and housekeeping services. House, including maid, utilities, and lawn service.

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

must be approved by the governing board in advance or disclosed at the end of the year.

Policies regarding the salary setting process

The five comparison systems have similar mechanisms for establishing initial salaries and providing salary increases. (A summary of policies regarding the setting of salaries also appears in Appendix B below.) Almost all systems use marketplace data as a criterion for setting and increasing salaries, although public systems salary levels and subsequent increases are limited by the availability of state resources. Two comparison systems use merit as a basis for salary increases.

Vice Chancellor positions

Display 15 on page 27 shows the difference between salaries, benefits, and total compensation paid to the various vice-chancellors and the General Counsel at the State University and similar positions at the comparison systems.

Salaries and compensation

Vice Chancellors at the State University earn salaries between 14.5 and 51.8 percent more than their counterparts at the selected comparison systems, between 8.4 and 43.6 percent more in benefits (as a function of their base salary), and between 13.1 and 49.6 percent more in total compensation.

It is important to note, however, that the specific position titles at the comparison systems in many instances are not comparable to the State University's Vice Chancellor positions. For example, only one position title among the comparison systems is comparable with that of the State University's Executive Vice Chancellor. Similarly, the Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations of the State University has far broader responsibilities than the Deputy Chancellor at the University of Maryland, whose position title is Director of Personnel and who, unlike his State University counterpart, has no responsibility over collective bargaining. **Therefore exceptional caution is needed when evaluating the salary and compensation levels of State University Vice Chancellors in light of their comparison institution counterparts.**

Benefits

The benefits provided to the State University's Vice Chancellors and General Counsel are comparable to those provided to the Chancellor of the system. Vice Chancellors receive group life insurance, medical/dental/vision insurance, disability, retirement, and deferred compensation plans. Benefits provided to Vice Chancellors are competitive with those provided by the comparison systems.

Perquisites

Vice Chancellors receive limited perquisites. These include a supplemental life insurance and eligibility for a tenured professorship upon resignation or dismissal. Perquisites provided to Vice-Chancellors are comparable to those provided by comparison systems.

Executive Vice Chancellor

Position

The Executive Vice Chancellor coordinates the functions of the other Vice Chancellors and acts as chief executive officer in the absence of the Chancellor. The Executive Vice Chancellor also supervises the system's information resource program and the operations of the Chancellor's Office.

Salary and benefits

Only one system reported a position similar in scope to that of the Executive Vice Chancellor. For this reason no comparative quantitative analysis is provided for this position title.

Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Position

The Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, has responsibility for all academic matters including program planning and review, admissions, financial aid, student records, outreach and retention, instructional

DISPLAY 15 *Salary, Benefits, and Total Compensation of State University Vice Chancellors Compared with Similar Positions at Comparison Systems*

Vice Presidency	The California State University Average	Number of Comparison Systems	Comparison Institution Mean	Percent State University Salary is Greater Than Comparison Group Mean:	Comparison Institution Median	Percent State University Salary is Greater Than Comparison Group Median:
Executive Vice Chancellor[1]						
Salary	$130,140	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Benefits	36,960	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Compensation	167,100	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs						
Salary	$128,304	5	$110,916	+15.7%	$112,059	+14.5%
Benefits	36,438		31,281	+16.5	33,618	+8.4
Total Compensation	164,742		142,197	+15.9	145,677	+13.1
Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs						
Salary	$128,304	5	$103,485	+24.0%	$98,895	+29.8%
Benefits	36,438		29,261	+24.5	29,669	+22.8
Total Compensation	164,742		132,746	+24.1	128,564	+28.1
Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations						
Salary	$128,304	4	$85,823	+49.5%	$84,519	+51.8%
Benefits	36,438		25,119	+45.1	25,375	+43.6
Total Compensation	164,742		110,942	+48.5	110,116	+49.6
Vice Chancellor, External Affairs						
Salary	$128,304	4	$100,946	+27.1%	$98,687	+30.0%
Benefits	36,438		27,487	+32.6	28,110	+29.6
Total Compensation	164,742		128,434	+28.3	126,786	+29.9
General Counsel						
Salary	$111,744	4	$89,176	+25.3%	$93,272	+19.8%
Benefits	31,735		24,785	+28.0	23,231	+36.6
Total Compensation	143,479		113,961	+25.9	116,503	+28.3

1. Only one position was comparable in scope to that of the State University's Executive Vice Chancellor, therefore no comparison is shown.

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

technology, international education and programs, extended education, library services and academic research and development.

Of five comparison systems, three top academic affairs officers had position responsibilities different than those of the State University's Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs. In two cases, the responsibilities were narrower in focus, and in one case the position included the responsibility for the preparation and implementation of a system strategic plan.

Salary and benefits

In 1990, the salary of the State University's Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, was the highest when compared to similar positions in the comparison group. The Vice Chancellor earned $128,304 -- 6.0 percent more than the highest salary paid in the comparison group and 15.7 percent higher than the mean salary for the group as a whole.

Because benefits are closely tied to base salary, the monetary value of benefits provided to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs was 16.5 percent greater than the average benefit package provided to similar executives in the comparison group.

Total compensation for the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, exceeded the comparison group's average by 13.1 percent.

Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs

Position

The State University's Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs, is responsible for all financial matters related to the system except those dealing with development. Responsibilities of this vice chancellor include budget planning and administration, physical planning and development, auxiliary and business services, management and business analysis, the system controller, interaction with the Legislature and Department of Finance to obtain State funds during the budget process, negotiating and overseeing contracts, and issuing bonds.

Of the five comparison systems, four indicated that they had a comparable position. Only one system indicated that it had a vice chancellor whose responsibilities included information management activities, certain facilities construction and maintenance services, accounting, treasury, risk management and procurement services.

Salary and benefits

The salary of the State University's Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs, was the highest when compared to similar positions in the comparison group. The Vice Chancellor earned $128,304 -- 6.3 percent more than the highest salary paid in the comparison group, and 24.0 percent higher than the mean salary for the group as a whole.

The monetary value of benefits provided to the Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs, was 24.5 percent greater than the average benefit package provided to similar executives in the comparison group.

Total compensation for the Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs, exceeded the comparison group's average total compensation by 24.1 percent.

Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations

Position

The State University's Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, is the system's most senior employee relations position. This position is responsible for personnel policy, management of faculty and staff compensation and benefits, employee classifications, collective bargaining, presidential recruitment, and affirmative action.

Of four comparison systems, only one system indicated that it had a comparable position. Three systems indicated that a similar position in their systems had different responsibilities. At one system, the incumbent had no collective bargaining responsibilities; at the second, the incumbent was not responsible for affirmative action; and at the third, the incumbent reported separately to the Chancellor, Senior Vice Chancellor, Provost, and the Board. Towers Perrin makes note in their report that "compensation data for this position understate the value of the job at the California State University be-

cause of the reporting relationships of the survey participants."

Salary and benefits

Taking the above caveats into consideration, the 1990-91 salary of the State University's Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, was the highest when compared to similar positions in the comparison group. This Vice Chancellor earned $128,304 -- 28.6 percent more than the highest salary paid in the comparison group, and 49.5 percent higher than the mean salary for the group as a whole.

The monetary value of benefits provided to the Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, was 45.1 percent greater than the average benefit package provided to similar executives in the comparison group.

Total compensation for the Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, exceeded the comparison group's average by 48.5 percent.

Vice Chancellor, University Affairs

Position

The State University's Vice Chancellor, University Affairs, is responsible for public and institutional relations, institutional research, development, executive management review, and the Trustee Secretariat. This position is also responsible for federal and State governmental relations.

Of four comparison systems, two systems indicated that they had a comparable position. Two systems indicated that a similar position in their systems had different responsibilities. At one system, the incumbent had responsibilities for the Information Resource Management Office, but did not function as Secretary to the Board. At the other system, the position was newly developed and was the consolidation of two vice-chancellor positions.

Salary and benefits

In 1990-91, the salary of the State University's Vice Chancellor, University Affairs, was the highest when compared to similar positions in the comparison group. This Vice Chancellor earned $128,304 -- 14.4 percent more than the highest salary paid in the comparison group, and 27.1 percent higher than the mean salary for the group as a whole.

The monetary value of benefits provided to the Vice Chancellor, University Affairs, was 32.6 percent greater than the average benefit package provided to similar executives in the comparison group.

Total compensation for the Vice Chancellor, University Affairs, exceeded the comparison group's average by 28.3 percent.

General Counsel

Position

The State University's General Counsel is the organization's chief legal advisor. The position is responsible for all legal matters except for some litigation that may be handled by the State's Attorney General's Office.

Of four comparison systems, three systems indicated that they had a comparable position. Only one system indicated that a similar position in their system had different responsibilities. The General Counsel at that system was the Corporate Secretary, and the position was also responsible for all litigation.

Salary and benefits

In 1990-91, the salary of the State University's General Counsel was the highest when compared to similar positions in the comparison group. The General Counsel earned $111,744 -- 2.8 percent more than the highest salary of the comparison group, and 25.3 percent higher than the mean salary for the group as a whole.

The monetary value of benefits provided to the General Counsel was 28.0 percent greater than the average benefit package provided to similar executives in the comparison group.

Total compensation for the General Counsel exceeded the comparison group's average total compensation by 25.9 percent.

Salaries and benefits of campus presidents

The analysis of salaries of California State University campus presidents is predicated upon several underlying criteria, the most important of which are campus size, function, mission, and role. The State University has significant variety among its campuses: They range in size from San Marcos -- a new institution with 448 headcount students and no degrees thus far -- to San Diego, enrolling 35,489 headcount students, and awarding 5,175 bachelor's, 1,243 master's, and 19 joint doctoral degrees last year alone. Therefore, caution is warranted when evaluating compensation levels of the system's various campus chief executive officers.

To alleviate inappropriate comparisons, Towers Perrin prepared an analysis using campus size as the underlying criterion for grouping institutions. Other criteria that were used in developing the sample were function, mission, and role similar to that of State University institutions.

Institutions were divided into four categories: institutions with full-time-equivalent enrollments below 5,000, 5,000 to 12,000, 12,000 to 20,000, and 20,000 or more. Display 16 on page 31 shows each group of comparison institutions and the corresponding State University campuses. (A more comprehensive presentation of salary and benefit data for the campus chief executive officers appears on pages 38 - 55 of the consultant's report.)

Campuses with under 5,000 FTE students

Three State University campuses have full-time-equivalent enrollments under 5,000: San Marcos, Stanislaus, and Bakersfield. Salary and benefit data for campus presidents were collected for ten comparison institutions whose full-time-equivalent enrollments were less than 5,000. Salaries of presidents at these ten comparison institutions ranged from $99,225 to $115,550, while salaries for the three State University presidents ranged from $115,956 to $118,212. In all cases, State University presidents in this category were paid more than the chief executives at the comparison campuses.

Display 17 on page 32 shows that State University presidents in this category earned on average 14.3 percent more in salary and 7.4 percent more in benefits than their counterparts. Total compensation for these State University executives outpaced their counterparts by an average 12.7 percent.

Health and retirement benefits provided to State University presidents were comparable to those provided by institutions in the comparison group. However, while all State University presidents can participate in a deferred compensation plan, only half of the institutions in the comparison group provide such a plan. In addition, only 30 percent of these comparison institutions provide an entertainment allowance, but all required entertainment as part of the job.

Campuses with 5,000 to 12,000 FTE students

Five State University campuses have full-time-equivalent enrollments of 5,000 to 12,000: Sonoma, Dominguez Hills, Humboldt, San Bernardino, and Hayward. Salary and benefit data for campus presidents were collected for 26 comparison institutions whose full-time-equivalent enrollments were between 5,000 and 12,000. President salaries at these 26 comparison institutions ranged from $85,000 to $157,400, while salaries for the five State University presidents ranged from $115,956 to $122,880.

Display 17 shows State University presidents in this category earned on average 7.4 percent more in salary and 9.1 percent more in benefits than their comparison institution counterparts. Total compensation for these State University executives is on average 7.7 percent greater than that provided to executives in the comparison group. Twenty comparison institutions in this category paid less in salary to their chief executives when compared to State University presidents, while six comparison institutions paid more.

The health and retirement benefits provided to State University presidents in this category were comparable to those provided by institutions in this comparison group. However, while all State University presidents can participate in a deferred compensation plan, 38 percent of the institutions in the comparison group provide no such plan. Fifty-eight percent of the institutions in the comparison group provide an entertainment allowance to their chief executive, and 96 percent required entertainment as part of the job.

DISPLAY 16 *Groups of Campuses Used for Comparison with State University Campuses by Size for Analyzing the Salaries of California State University Campus Presidents*

Full-Time-Equivalent Enrollment	Comparison Institutions		Campuses of the California State University
Below 5,000	City University of New York Graduate Center State University System of Florida University of North Florida University of Maryland Frostburg State College University of Baltimore Salisbury State University	State University of New York College at Fredonia College at Genesco College at Old Westbury College at Potsdam College at Purchase	Bakersfield San Marcos Stanislaus
5,000 to 12,000	City University of New York John Jay College Lehman College College of Staten Island City College New York City College Brooklyn College Baruch College Idaho State University Indiana State University Montana State University Montclair State College University of Colorado - Denver	State University System of Florida Florida Atlantic University Florida A&M University University of West Florida University of Maryland Towson State University Baltimore Country State University of New York College at Brockport College at Buffalo College at Cortland College at Empire State College at New Paltz College at Oneonta College at Oswego College at Plattsburgh	Dominguez Hills Hayward Humboldt San Bernardino Sonoma
12,000 to 20,000	City University of New York Hunter College Queens College Memphis State University Montana State University	State University System of Florida Florida Atlantic University Florida International University University of South Florida University of Hawaii - Manoa State University of New York SUNY at Albany	Chico Fresno Fullerton Los Angeles Pomona Sacramento San Luis Obispo
20,000 and Above	State University System of Florida Florida State University University of Florida	University of Maryland College Park University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	Long Beach Northridge San Diego San Francisco San Jose

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

DISPLAY 17 Comparison of Salary and Benefits for Campus Presidents at the California State University and Selected Institutions, 1990-91

Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment	Number of State University Campuses	State University Mean Salaries/Benefits/ Total Compensation	Number of Comparison Institutions	Comparison Institution Mean Salaries/Benefits/ Total Comparison	Percent State University Salary is Greater or Less Than Comparison Group Mean:
Less than 5,000					
Salaries	3	$116,966	10	$102,352	+14.3%
Benefits	3	33,218	10	30,919	+7.4
Total Compensation	3	150,184	10	133,271	+12.7
5,000 - 12,000					
Salaries	5	$118,224	26	$110,114	+7.4%
Benefits	5	33,576	26	30,781	+9.1
Total Compensation	5	151,800	26	140,895	+7.7
12,000 - 20,000					
Salaries	7	$122,705	8	$119,432	+2.7%
Benefits	7	34,849	8	31,389	+11.0
Total Compensation	7	157,554	8	150,821	+4.5
20,000 and Above					
Salaries	5	$121,956	4	$147,387	-17.3%
Benefits	5	34,635	4	39,970	-13.3
Total Compensation	5	156,591	4	187,357	-16.4

Source: Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

Campuses with 12,000 to 20,000 FTE students

Seven State University campuses have full-time-equivalent enrollments of 12,000 to 20,000: Chico, Los Angeles, Pomona, San Luis Obispo, Fresno, Fullerton, and Sacramento. Salary and benefit data for campus presidents were collected for eight comparison institutions whose full-time-equivalent enrollments were between 12,000 and 20,000. President salaries at these eight comparison institutions ranged from $95,000 to $133,161, while salaries for the seven State University presidents ranged from $115,956 to $124,020.

Display 17 shows State University presidents in this category earned an average 2.7 percent more in salary and 11.0 percent more in benefits than their counterparts. Total compensation for these State University executives is an average 4.5 percent greater than that provided to the similar executives in the comparison group. Four comparison institutions in this category paid less in salary to their chief executives when compared to State University presidents, while four paid more.

Health and retirement benefits provided to State University presidents in this category were comparable to those provided by institutions in this comparison group. Again, however, while all State University presidents can participate in a deferred compensation plan, 25 percent of the institutions in the comparison group provide no such plan. Eighty-eight percent of the institutions in this category's comparison group provide an entertainment allowance to their chief executive, and all organizations required entertainment as part of the job.

Campuses with 20,000 FTE students or more

Five State University campuses have full-time-equivalent enrollments of 20,000 or more: San Francisco, Northridge, San Jose, Long Beach, and San Diego. Salary and benefit data for campus presidents were collected for four comparison institutions whose full-time-equivalent enrollments were 20,000 or more. Presidential salaries at these four comparison institutions ranged from $100,000 to $190,550, while salaries for the five State University presidents in this category ranged from $120,012 to $124,020.

Display 17 on the opposite page shows State University presidents in this category earned an average 17.3 percent less in salary and 13.3 percent less in benefits than their counterparts. Total compensation for these State University Presidents is an average 16.4 percent lower than that provided to comparable executives in the comparison group.

Three of the four comparison institutions in this category paid more in salary and benefits to their chief executives than those paid to State University presidents. One institution did not provide any deferred compensation program -- a program in which all State University presidents can participate. Three of the comparison institutions required entertainment as part of the job, but only two of them provided an entertainment allowance.

Other perquisites provided to State University presidents

Currently each State University campus president is provided with the use of a car, sabbatical leave, and a tenured professorship. In addition, the presidents at Chico, Fresno, Fullerton, Pomona, and San Luis Obispo are provided with a house. The remaining State University presidents receive a housing allowance.

The perquisites provided to State University presidents are comparable to those provided to chief executive officers at the comparison institutions. Other perquisites may be provided to their campus chief executives, such as professional travel, or a driver, but none of these are provided to State University presidents. A list of these other perquisites, and the percent of institutions providing these extra benefits appears on Display 14 on page 25 above.

Salaries of selected State University campus-based administrators

Display 18 on the next page shows the salaries of 18 campus-based administrator positions, based on the State University's list of faculty salary comparison institutions. (A list of these institutions appears in the note of that display.) **Although several of these institutions appear on comparison lists used by Towers Perrin in its analysis of compensation, the analysis that follows is not comparable to the Towers Perrin analysis of compensation for campus presidents.**

For the selected campus-based positions, between four and twenty comparison institutions reported data for the various positions. Because of the varying number of institutions reporting comparable positions, the analysis that follows should be viewed with caution.

As shown in Display 18, during 1989-90, the State University paid between 0.6 and 14.4 percent more for four positions, and between 0.6 and 23.0 percent less for 13 positions, than its reporting comparison institutions. The State University has consistently paid substantially more than its comparison universities to its Directors of Institutional Research and Directors of Student Financial Aid -- and consistently less to all of its deans. Among deans, the greatest divergence is for Deans of Agriculture (23.0 percent below the comparison group) and Deans of Business (16.0 percent below the comparison groups); and the least is for Deans of Fine Arts (0.6 percent less) and Deans of Education (1.8 percent less).

DISPLAY 18 Selected Campus-Based Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1990-91

Administrative Title	Number of California State University Campuses	California State University Mean	Number of Comparison Institutions	Comparison Institution Mean	Percent State University Salary is Greater or Less than Comparison Group Mean:
Chief Academic Officer	19	$101,637	16	$108,989	-7.2%
Chief Business Officer	18	86,555	13	99,643	-15.1
Chief Budgeting Officer	N/A	N/A	13	65,590	--
Director, Personnel/ Human Resources	19	66,008	16	67,995	-3.0
Director of Libraries	18	79,196	17	78,723	+0.6
Director of Computer Center	4	88,578	11	86,609	+2.2
Director of Physical Plant	15	60,806	15	73,402	-20.7
Director of Campus Security	18	55,347	15	57,259	-3.5
Director of Institutional Research	13	66,252	13	60,871	+8.1
Director of Student Financial Aid	20	62,280	17	53,295	+14.4
Director of Athletics	17	67,177	16	79,382	-18.2
Dean of Agriculture	4	86,643	3	106,555	-23.0
Dean of Arts and Sciences	19	85,872	13	95,179	-10.8
Dean of Business	19	88,255	12	102,332	-16.0
Dean of Education	18	83,548	14	85,032	-1.8
Dean of Engineering	11	91,664	12	104,193	-13.7
Dean of Graduate Programs	7	81,435	13	93,516	-14.8
Dean of Fine Arts	5	82,634	6	83,095	-0.6

Note: Comparison institutions include Arizona State University, University of Bridgeport, Bucknell University, Cleveland State University, University of Colorado (Denver), Georgia State University, Loyola University, Mankato State University, University of Maryland (Baltimore), University of Nevada (Reno), North Carolina State University, Reed College, Rutgers University (Newark), State University of New York (Albany), University of Southern California, University of Texas (Arlington), Tufts University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Wayne State University, and University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee).

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

Executive Compensation at the University of California

Background

In 1987, the Regents of the University of California contracted with Towers Perrin to conduct a study of executive compensation for selected Regents' officers and selected high-level system and campus-based executives. In order to evaluate how the overall competitiveness of these positions had changed over the past four years, the University in 1991 again contracted with Towers Perrin to replicate its earlier study.

This more recent study examines several position titles beyond the scope of the Commission's legislative directive, but it does provide data regarding executive compensation at comparable institutions for those positions under review by the Commission.

In addition, pursuant to a Commission request, Towers Perrin obtained policy information regarding outside income, how salary is set at the time of hire, and how salary increases are calculated.

Copies of the consultant's final report that was prepared for the Regents and its special report prepared for the Commission are available upon request. For purposes of its compensation analysis, the Commission relied solely on data in the Towers Perrin report.

Positions under study

The positions selected for the University's executive compensation analysis are:

President
Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs
Senior Vice President -- Administration
Vice President -- Health Affairs
Vice President -- Budget and University Relations
Campus Chancellors

Comparison institutions

Comparison institutions were selected after extensive consultation with staff of the Commission and representatives of the Office of the Legislative Analyst, the Department of Finance, and the University of California. Data were solicited for five systems and eighteen individual campuses. A list of those institutions that participated appears below as Display 19.

DISPLAY 19 Systems and Institutions Used for Comparison with the University of California for the Commission's Study of Executive Compensation

University Systems
- State University of New York[1]
- University of California
- University of Colorado System
- University of Illinois
- University of Michigan
- University of Minnesota
- University of Texas System
- University of Wisconsin[2]

Single Campus Universities
- Brown University
- California Institute of Technology
- Columbia University
- Cornell University
- Duke University
- Harvard University
- The Johns Hopkins University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Northwestern University
- Stanford University
- University of Chicago
- University of Pennsylvania
- University of Virginia
- University of Washington
- Yale University

1. Includes only Stony Brook and Buffalo Chancellors.
2. Includes only Madison Chancellor.

Source: Towers Perrin, *University of California 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Report*, April 1991.

Size and scope

Display 20 below shows that, when compared to its comparison group of systems and campuses, the University ranks first in all size and scope measurement categories, except in the number of medical faculty, in which it ranks second.

Display 21 on page 37 shows that the University employs 148,237 persons, including academicians, professionals, administrators, technicians, and support staff. Its total budget, including hospitals, research units, and the administration of U.S. Department of Energy laboratories, is nearly $8.3 billion.

DISPLAY 20 University of California's Comparative Rank to Other Systems and Campuses, 1991

Type of Institution	Selected Characteristic	University of California Rank[1]
University Systems		
	Total Employees	1
	Headcount	1
	Full-Time Equivalent	1
	Union Employees	1
	Total Budget	1
	Total Grants	1
	Total Non-Grant Revenue	1
	Laboratory Budget	1
Single-Campus Universities		
	Total Enrollment	1
	Total Faculty	1
	Medical Faculty	2
	Nonfaculty Full-Time Equivalents	1
	Total Undergraduate Students	1
	Total Graduate Students	1
	Total Medical Students	1
	Masters Degrees Granted	1
	Doctoral Degrees Granted	1
	Medical Degrees Granted	1
	Number of Campuses	1

1. Illinois and Texas did not provide organization scope data. The headcount comparison excludes laboratories.

Source: Towers Perrin, *University of California 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Report*, April 1991.

It enrolled over 166,000 students last fall and awarded approximately 24,800 bachelor's and 10,600 advanced degrees (master's, doctorates, and professional) last year alone. By far, the University is the largest and most complex centrally administered higher education doctoral degree-granting and research enterprise in the nation.

The analysis that follows is based on comparison systems and campuses that were selected by the Commission's advisory committee. All but two institutions agreed to participate. **It is important to note, however, that after the advisory committee agreed to a list of comparison institutions, Towers Perrin and the University of California determined that the list selected by the advisory committee was not appropriate, in that it does not include the full range of organizations to which the University usually compares itself.**

This present report excludes educational and research enterprises such as the Mayo Clinic, the Ford Foundation, and SRI International -- enterprises that were included in the analysis prepared by Towers Perrin for the Regents. **Therefore, the following analysis is NOT comparable to the Towers Perrin report for the Regents.**

Caveat regarding the analysis of University data

The University has indicated to the Commission that the list of comparison institutions used in the Commission's report is in their opinion "a useful reference point." However, the University believes that the Commission's list of comparison institutions does not "reflect the actual labor market for University positions" and does not "fully represent the universe from which UC both draws experienced senior managers and with whom the University competes in attracting the best candidates."

The University has also indicated to the Commission that it believes "that it is difficult to find any appropriate comparators among academic institutions for systemwide positions since UC is by far the largest academic employer in the United States." The University therefore has suggested that because of its sheer size and complexity, "for systemwide positions, the appropriate comparison is to the 75th percentile of compensation at the comparison institutions, rather than to median compensation" and that "for campus positions, the appropriate

DISPLAY 21 *Size and Scope of the University of California and Other Comparable Systems and Campuses, 1991*[1]

Characteristic	Number of University of California Campuses	University of California	Number of Comparison Institutions	Low	Median	Mean	High
Total Number of Employees	9	148,237	7	10,831	12,744	14,804	21,675
Total Number of FTE Employees	9	92,550	4		13,828	13,989	
Employees in Labor Agreement	9	41,428	7	454	1,362	2,425	5,261
Total Budget in Millions of Dollars	9	$6,000	11	495	1,008	1,019	1,762
Total Lab Budget in Millions of Dollars[2]	9	$2,279	2		272	272	
Total Grants in Millions of Dollars	9	$1,300	7	184	227	235	323
Total Nongrants in Millions of Dollars	9	$4,700	7	409	765	786	1,518
Total Enrollment							
Undergraduate	9	125,357	10	3,433	6,513	13,289	41,569
Graduate	9	33,597	10	3,942	8,446	8,391	13,454
Medical Student	9	7,410	10	411	687	986	1,959
Full-Time-Equivalent Nonfaculty Staff	9	85,605	7	6,125	8,253	10,672	16,763
Degrees Granted							
Masters	9	6,918	7	941	2,117	1,979	2,946
Doctorates	9	3,101	7	168	544	538	1,058
Medical Doctorates	9	627	7	86	103	136	233

1. Based only on comparison institutions whose chief executive officer position matched that of the President of the University of California.

2. Excluding Department of Energy laboratory budget.

Source: Towers Perrin, *CPEC Analysis of the University of California, 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Study*, May 1991.

comparison is to compensation at or above the median."

Although Commission staff uses the mean salary paid at comparison institutions as its benchmark for salary comparisons, median salary data, as well as lowest and highest comparison institution salaries paid, appear in the report to aid the reader in computing a variety of salary differentials.

Special note regarding the University's Nonqualified Deferred Income Program and the Commission's analysis

In order to make its executive recruiting and retention as competitive as possible, the University of California in 1987 established for its high-level executives a Nonqualified Deferred Income Program. This program allows these executives to accrue a cash benefit equal to 5 percent of their salary base each year for five years. At the end of the five-year period, and for each year thereafter, the executive begins to collect additional cash payments equal to approximately 25 percent of his current year's base salary.

Executives who participate in this program receive no cash benefits or cash value from this program until the first five-year period has elapsed, and they only receive payouts based on the previous five years of contribution. If an executive leaves before the end of the first five years, he or she forfeits any and all potential income accrued in the plan. Executives who retire receive a proportion of any ac-

crued cash value in the plan, but only after the initial five years have elapsed.

The analysis that follows includes the estimated value of the Nonqualified Deferred Income Program in calculating the cash value of salaries provided to selected University executives. It should be noted, however, that no executive in the University has yet received any "real cash distributions" from the program, in that distributions from the program will begin on January 1, 1993, for those executives who have participated for the full five years of the program. No State resources are used for funding the program.

President

The University of California's President is the chief executive officer of the system, and is responsible for the administration and operation of all nine campuses in the system. The President is the official representative of the University before all governmental entities. The position reports directly to the governing Board of Regents, of which the President is a member. The President is also responsible for three national laboratories and five teaching hospitals.

Towers Perrin notes in their report that "Because of the size and complexity of the University of California, the President has few truly comparable counterparts in other organizations." The Commission's analysis of the President's position includes comparison institutions that are large university systems and large and small single-campus universities. Although many of these same single-campus institutions are used for analyzing the compensation of the University's Chancellors, the Commission believes that these campuses are also appropriate for analyzing the President's compensation.

Salary

Displays 22 and 23 on page 39 show that in 1990-91 the President of the University was paid $243,500 and would have received an additional $64,400 from the Nonqualified Deferred Income Program if he had qualified for these funds. The President will begin to receive a cash compensation from the program in 1993.

The salaries paid to the chief executive officers of 12 comparison systems and campuses ranged from $152,300 to $345,000; the President's salary exceeded the comparison group mean by 3.0 percent. If Nonqualified Deferred Income Program funds had been available and dispersed, the President's salary would have exceeded the comparison group mean by 30.3 percent, yet still would have trailed the highest salary paid to a chief executive by 10.8 percent.

Display 23 shows that in comparison to four other system chief executive officers, the President of the University earned 44.9 percent more than his counterparts; if Nonqualified Deferred Income Program funds had been available, the President's salary would have exceeded the salary paid to these comparison systems' chief executives by 83.2 percent.

Perquisites

Display 24 on page 40 shows those perquisites provided to the University's President and Chancellors and to comparison institution and system executives. The University's President receives several perquisites. In parenthesis following the perquisite is the percent of comparison institutions that provide the same perquisite. The President's perquisites include an automobile (58 percent), club dues (25 percent), a driver available (25 percent), an entertainment fund (58 percent), estate planning (0 percent), house maintenance (58 percent), a housing allowance (67 percent), sabbatical leave (33 percent), tax planning or tax preparation (0 percent), and a tenured professorship (42 percent).

Several comparison institutions provide perquisites to their chief executive that the University does not provide to its President. These include a car phone (although a portable car phone is available to University executives), educational aid to children, an employment contract, and a physical examination.

Senior Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents receive many of the same perquisites that are provided to the President.

Policies regarding outside income and employment

Each comparison system has specific policies regarding outside income and employment. (A summary of those policies appears in Appendix C below.) In general, outside income and employment

DISPLAY 22 *Comparison of Salary Compensation of the President of the University of California and the Mean and Median Salary Compensation Paid to the Chief Executive of Selected Comparison Campuses and Systems, with Selected Institutional Characteristics*

Characteristic	Number of University of California Campuses	University of California	Number of Comparison Systems and Campuses	Low	Median	Mean	High	Percent University Salary is Greater Than Comparison Group Mean:
Compensation								
Salary	9	$243,500	12	$152,300	$239,750	$236,318	$345,000	+3.0%
Current Cash	9	0	8	0	0	0	0	--
Deferred Cash	9	$64,400	8	0	0	0	0	--
Total Compensation	9	$307,900	12	$152,300	$239,750	$236,318	$345,000	+30.3
System Characteristics								
Total Budget in Millions[1]	9	$6,000	12	$495	$1,017	$1,040	$1,762	--
Total Number of Employees	9	148,237	8	9,631	13,602	16,191	30,009	--

1. Excluding Department of Energy laboratory budget.

Source: Towers Perrin, *CPEC Analysis of the University of California, 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Study*, May 1991.

DISPLAY 23 *Comparison of Salary Compensation of the President of the University of California and the Mean and Median Salary Compensation Paid to the Chief Executive Officer of Selected Comparison Systems, with Selected System Characteristics*

Characteristic	Number of University of California Campuses	University of California	Number of Comparison Systems	Median	Mean	Percent University Salary is Greater Than Comparison Group Mean:
Compensation						
Salary	9	$243,500	4	$161,741	$168,045	+44.9%
Current Cash	9	0	3	0	0	--
Deferred Cash	9	$64,400	3	0	0	--
Total Compensation	9	$307,900	4	$161,741	$168,045	+83.2
System Characteristics						
Total Budget in Millions[1]	9	$6,000	4	$1,532	$1,523	--
Total Number of Employees	9	148,237	3	21,675	23,780	--

1. Excluding Department of Energy laboratory budget.

Source: Towers Perrin, *CPEC Analysis of the University of California, 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Study*, May 1991.

DISPLAY 24 Benefits and Perquisites Provided to University of California Executives in Comparison to Those Provided by Comparable Institutions, 1991

Benefits and Perquisites	Percent of Surveed Institutions Providing[1] All Positions Similar to President (N = 12)[2]	System Executives Similar to President (N = 4)[2]	Campus Chancellors (N = 27)[2]	University of California President	University of California Chancellors
Benefits					
Supplemental Life Insurance	17%	0%	30%	X	X
Supplemental Medical Insurance	0	0	7		
Supplemental Retirement	0	0	19	X	X
Supplemental Vacation	0	0	0	X	X
Perquisites					
Automobile or Automobile Allowance	58	75	67	X	X
Car Phone	33	50	33		
Club Dues	25	25	41	X	X
Driver Available	25	25	26	X	
Educational Aid to Children	33	0	26		
Employment Contract	33	25	30		
Entertainment Fund	58	50	63	X	X
Estate Planning	0	0	0	X	X
House Maintenance	58	75	52	X	X
House or Housing Allowance	67	75	63	X	X
Low-Income Mortgage Loan	0	0	11	X	X
Physical Exam	33	25	33		
Sabbatical Leave	33	25	41	X	X
Tax Planning or Tax Preparation	0	0	0	X	X
Tenured Professorship	42	25	63	X	X

1. The data reflect executive benefits and perquisites identified by the participants. Texas did not report benefits or perquisites.

2. N = The number of organizations in the sample.

Source: Towers Perrin, *CPEC Analysis of the University of California, 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Study*, May 1991.

are permitted provided these activities do no interfere with the normal assigned responsibilities of the chief executive or cause a conflict of interest. In one case, if the chief executive uses university facilities, then appropriate charges for the use of these facilities are assessed.

Policies regarding the salary setting process

The comparison systems and campuses have mechanisms similar to those employed by the University for establishing initial salaries and for providing salary increases. (A summary of practices regarding the setting of salaries also appears in Appendix C.) Almost all systems use marketplace data as a criterion for setting and increasing salaries. Several comparison institutions use merit as a basis for salary increases.

Vice President positions

Display 25 on the opposite page shows the difference between salaries and deferred cash paid to the

DISPLAY 25 *Comparison of Salary Compensation for University Senior Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents, and the Mean and Median Salary Compensation Paid to Similar Executive of Selected Comparison Institutions and Systems*

Position and Characteristic	Number of University of California Campuses	University of California	Number of Comparison Systems and Campuses	Low	Median	Mean	High	Percent University Salary is Greater or Less Than Comparison Group Mean:
Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs								
Salary	9	$170,000	11	$127,500	$178,500	$174,468	$210,500	-2.6%
Current Cash	9	0	7	0	0	0	0	--
Deferred Cash	9	29,200	7	0	0	0	0	--
Total Compensation	9	199,200	11	127,500	178,500	174,468	210,500	+14.2
Senior Vice President -- Administration								
Salary	9	170,000	10	130,000	165,675	162,883	210,500	+4.4
Current Cash	9	0	6	0	0	0	0	--
Deferred Cash	9	29,200	6	0	0	0	0	--
Total Compensation	9	199,200	10	130,000	165,675	162,883	210,500	+22.3
Vice President -- Budget and University Relations								
Salary	9	155,000	8	78,700	112,850	112,213	147,000	+38.1
Current Cash	9	0	4		0	0		--
Deferred Cash	9	25,000	4		0	0		--
Total Compensation	9	180,000	8	78,700	112,850	112,213	147,000	+60.4
Vice President -- Health Affairs								
Salary	9	153,300	11	90,000	187,000	207,585	349,350	-26.2
Current Cash	9	0	7	0	0	0	0	--
Deferred Cash	9	24,800	7	0	0	0	0	--
Total Compensation	9	178,100	11	90,000	187,000	207,585	349,350	-14.2

Source: Towers Perrin, *CPEC Analysis of the University of California, 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Study*, May 1991.

various vice-presidents at the University and to similar executive positions at the comparison systems and campuses. **It is important to note, however, that the specific position titles at the comparison systems in many instances are not comparable to the University's Senior Vice President and Vice President positions. Therefore it is appropriate to exercise caution when evaluating the cash compensation levels of University Senior Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents when compared to their comparison institution counterparts.**

Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs

Position

The Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs at the University has responsibility for all issues re-

lated to academic affairs for the entire University system. Responsibilities include the oversight of the student population, library plans and policies, laboratory affairs, faculty affairs, the University Press, educational relations and student services. The position is also responsible for University community extension programs, including adult education and continuing and professional education. Four comparison systems and seven campuses had a position comparable to this University position.

Salary

Display 25 shows that in 1990-91 the Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs of the University of California was paid $170,000; and would have received an additional $29,200 from the Nonqualified Deferred Income Program if he had qualified for these funds. Salaries paid to the chief academic officer at 11 comparison systems and campuses ranged from $127,500 to $210,500. The salary for the Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs lagged the comparison group mean by 2.6 percent. If the deferred income program funds had been available and dispersed, this senior vice president's salary would have exceeded the comparison group mean by 14.2 percent, but still would have trailed the highest salary paid to a chief academic officer by 5.4 percent.

Senior Vice President -- Administration

Position

The University's Senior Vice President -- Administration is responsible for all matters related to personnel, finance, information systems, and planning and development for the entire system. Personnel responsibilities include compensation, benefits, collective bargaining, and employee relations. Finance responsibilities include accounting, contracts and grants, intellectual property (trademarks and copyrights), financial analysis and safety risk management. This position is responsible for business operations, analysis and auditing. Three comparison systems and seven campuses had a position comparable to this University position.

Salary

Display 25 shows that in 1990-91 the Senior Vice President -- Administration for the University was paid $170,000; and would have received an additional $29,200 from the Nonqualified Deferred Income Program if he had qualified for these funds. Salaries paid to the chief administrative officer at 12 comparison systems and campuses ranged from $130,000 to $210,500. The Senior Vice President -- Administration's salary exceeded the comparison group mean by 4.4 percent. If the deferred income program funds had been available and dispersed, this senior vice president's salary would have exceeded the comparison group mean by 22.3 percent, but still would have trailed the highest salary paid to a chief administrative officer by 5.4 percent.

Vice President -- Budget and University Relations

Position

The Vice President -- Budget and University Relations is responsible for negotiating the budget, developing and maintaining effective relationships with federal and State governments. The officer also has responsibility for capital improvements planning, facilities maintenance, and budget development. This position conducts short- and long-term budget and financial studies and develops policy relating to land use plans.

Towers Perrin notes in their report that this position includes a combination of budget responsibility and government relations, and that this combination does not exist elsewhere among the comparison group of institutions. However, two systems and six campuses had positions with similar, but not as broad, functional responsibilities.

Salary

Display 25 shows that in 1990-91 the Vice President -- Budget and University Relations for the University was paid $155,000; and would have received an additional $25,000 from the Nonqualified Deferred Income Program if he had qualified for these funds.

The salaries paid to the chief budget and/or university relations officer at eight comparison systems and campuses ranged from $78,700 to $147,000. The Vice President -- Budget and University Relations salary exceeded the comparison group mean by 38.1 percent. If the deferred income program funds had been available and dispersed, this vice president's salary would have exceeded the comparison group mean by 60.4 percent, and would have exceeded the highest salary paid to a chief budget and/or university relations officer by 22.4 percent.

Vice President -- Health Affairs

Position

The Vice President -- Health Affairs is responsible for all matters relating to health affairs, health policy and legislative analysis, including hospital operations and fiscal planning. This officer sets policy for the University's medical school, training programs, and health care facilities. This position acts as a resource to the University and government agencies on health issues and requires an earned doctorate in an appropriate discipline. Three comparison systems and eight campuses had a position comparable to this University position.

Salary

Display 25 shows that in 1990-91 the University's Vice President -- Health Affairs was paid $153,300; and would have received an additional $24,800 from the Nonqualified Deferred Income Program if he had qualified for these funds. Salaries paid to the chief health affairs officer at 11 comparison systems and campuses ranged from $90,000 to $349,350. Because several comparison institutions paid very high salaries to their chief health affairs officers, the salary of the Vice President -- Health Affairs at the University lagged the comparison group mean by 26.2 percent. If the deferred income program funds had been available and dispersed, this vice president's salary would have lagged the comparison group mean by 14.2 percent, and would have lagged the highest salary paid to a chief health affairs officer by 49.0 percent.

Benefits provided to executives

All comparison systems provide standard benefits similar to those provided by the University, such as group life insurance, a medical plan, a dental plan, and a pension plan. Data regarding the specific value of or the actual types of benefits provided to executives by the comparison institutions were not collected by Towers Perrin. Therefore no comparative benefits analysis is provided.

Data are available, however, regarding the types and value of benefits provided by the University of California to its executives, including those at the systemwide and campus levels. Display 26 below shows that on the average, University benefits are approximately 18.44 percent of payroll cost. This percentage would be significantly higher if the University was still paying a retirement contribution. However, in 1990, the University of California's Retirement System exceeded actuarial estimates, and because of its high level of capitalization, the fund no longer requires the University to provide a contribution on behalf of its employees. The real "value" of benefits provided to executives is therefore greater than the 18.44 percent shown, and more likely approximates the 28 percent provided to State University executives, as discussed in the section on the State University's executive benefits.

DISPLAY 26 Cost of Fringe Benefits as a Percent of Payroll, University of California, 1991

Fringe Benefit	Percent of Payroll
Retirement (UCRS)[1]	0.00%
Social Security (FICA)	5.90
Health Plans	8.98
Dental Plans	1.10
Vision Plans	0.29
Unemployment Insurance	0.11
Workers' Compensation	1.59
Life Insurance	0.24
Temporary Disability (NDI)	0.23
Total	18.44%

1. Because the capitalization of the University of California Retirement System (UCRS) exceeds actuarial needs, the employer no longer makes a contribution to the fund.

In addition to those benefits shown in Display 26, the President, Senior Vice Presidents, Vice Presidents, and Chancellors receive supplemental life insurance, supplemental retirement, and supplemental vacation.

Campus chancellors

The analysis of University Chancellor salaries is predicated upon several underlying criteria, the most important of which are campus size, function, mission, and role. Like the State University, the University has significant variety among its campuses. Campuses range in size from San Francisco with 3,718 headcount students who are primarily in the Health Sciences to Los Angeles with 35,730 headcount students in many disciplines. Furthermore, several campuses like Berkeley and Los Angeles have large extensive research components, while smaller campuses such as Santa Cruz participate in smaller research activities. Therefore, caution is warranted when evaluating compensation levels of the University's Chancellors in that the functional job responsibilities of these executives vary.

Towers Perrin's analysis regarding the University's Chancellors uses a single group of comparison institutions, which unlike the State University's analysis, are not differentiated by campus size. It is appropriate, however, to consolidate these comparison institutions into a single category, in that these institutions are largely comparable to the University in measures such as function, mission, and role.

Chancellors' salaries and benefits

In 1990-91, salaries for the nine Chancellors at the University ranged from $143,700 to $211,000. If Nonqualified Deferred Income Program funds had been available to these Chancellors, their salaries would have ranged from $166,500 to $243,300.

Cash compensation data for campus chief executive officer were collected for 27 comparison institutions. Chief executive salaries at these institutions ranged from $109,500 to $345,000. Display 27 on the opposite page shows that the average University Chancellor's salary lagged the comparison group mean by 14.7 percent and the group's median salary by 5.3 percent. If the deferred income program funds had been paid, Chancellor salaries would still have lagged the mean salary paid to the comparison group by 1.9 percent, but would have exceeded the median salary by 7.4 percent.

Perquisites provided to University Chancellors

Display 24 on page 40 above shows those perquisites provided to the University's President and Chancellors and to comparison institution and system executives. University Chancellors receive several perquisites. In parenthesis following the perquisite is the percent of comparison institutions that provide the same perquisite. The Chancellors' perquisites include an automobile (67 percent), club dues (33 percent), an entertainment fund (63 percent), estate planning (0 percent), housing maintenance (52 percent), a housing allowance (63 percent), a low interest mortgage loan (11 percent), sabbatical leave (41 percent), tax planning or tax preparation (0 percent), and a tenured professorship (63 percent).

Several comparison institutions provide perquisites to their campus chief executive that the University does not provide to its president. These include a car phone, a driver, educational aid to children, an employment contract, and a physical examination.

Proportion of executive salaries funded by sources other than the State General Fund

Several of the University's executive positions are funded from sources other than the State General Fund. Specifically, as shown in Display 28 on the opposite page, the President receives only 68 percent of his salary from the State; the Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs receives 90 percent; the Senior Vice President -- Administration 65 percent; the Vice President -- Budget and University Relations, 90 percent; and the Vice President -- Health Affairs, 95 percent. The salaries of the campus Chancellors are funded entirely from State revenue. Salary increases for these executives in 1990-91 ranged from 5.6 to 6.0 percent.

DISPLAY 27 *Comparison of Salary and Deferred Costs for Chancellors at the University of California and Selected Institutions, with Number of Personnel, 1990-91*

Item	Number of University of California Campuses	University of California Amount	Number of Comparison Institutions	Low	Median	Mean	High	Percent University Salary is Less Than Comparison Group Mean:
Salary	9	$164,756	27	$109,500	$174,000	$193,178	$345,000	-14.7%
Deferred Cash	9	26,011	20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Compensation	9	190,767	27	109,500	177,678	194,382	345,000	-1.9
Number of FTE Employees Reporting to the Position[1]	9	11,686	19	1,262	9,968	14,081	35,300	--

1. Excluding Department of Energy Laboratories.

Source: *Towers Perrin, CPEC Analysis of the University of California, 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Study*, May 1991.

DISPLAY 28 *Actual Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California, 1990-91, Range of Increase Over 1989-90, and Percent of Salary Funded by the State's General Fund*

Administrative Title	Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salary, 1990-91[1]	Range of Increase Over 1989-90	Percent Funded by State General Fund
President	$243,500	5.6%	68%
Senior Vice President -- Academic Affairs	170,000	5.7	90
Senior Vice President -- Administration	170,000	5.7	65
Vice President -- Budget and University Relations	155,000	6.0	90
Vice President -- Health Affairs	153,300	6.0	95
Chancellors	143,700 - 211,000	N/A	100

1. Excludes value of Nonqualified Deferred Income Program.

Source: University of California, Office of the President and Towers Perrin.

Selected University of California campus-based administrator positions

The University of California surveyed 17 campus-based administrator positions, in addition to the analysis provided by Towers Perrin for the campus chief executive officer. Calculations presented in this analysis were made using the University's list of faculty salary comparison institutions. (A list of these institutions appears in the note of Display 29.) Although several of these institutions appear on the comparison list used by Towers Perrin in its analysis of the executive salary, the analysis that follows is **not** comparable to the analysis of compensation for Chancellors presented above.

The University received administrator salary data from seven of its eight faculty salary comparison institutions; Yale University did not provide any data this year. Display 29 on page 46 shows the data submitted by the University of California and seven of its comparison institutions for selected campus-based positions in 1990-91. As shown, the University's administrative salaries trailed comparison-group salaries in all but four position categories -- Director of Personnel, Chief of Physical Plant, Di-

DISPLAY 29 Annual Year-End Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1990-91

Administrative Title	University of California Average	Comparison Institution Mean	Percent University Salary is Greater or Less Than Comparison Group Mean
Chief Academic Officer	$137,522	$147,016	-6.5%
Chief Business Officer	124,438	138,330	-10.0
Director, Personnel/Human Resources	96,065	88,431	+8.6
Chief Budgeting Officer	93,139	104,988	-11.3
Director, Library Services	104,488	113,463	-7.9
Director, Computer Center	100,200	103,274	-3.0
Chief, Physical Plant	97,058	96,792	+0.3
Director, Campus Security	77,300	74,684	+3.5
Director, Information Systems	94,545	96,849	-2.4
Director, Student Financial Aid	72,769	74,344	-2.1
Director, Athletics	103,243	103,670	-0.4
Dean of Agriculture	128,967	115,100	+12.0
Dean of Arts and Sciences	115,171	117,987	-2.4
Dean of Business	126,340	154,876	-18.4
Dean of Education	114,425	117,307	-2.5
Dean of Engineering	130,771	147,498	-11.3
Dean of Graduate Programs	116,644	116,481	-0.1

Note: Comparison institutions include Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Stanford University, the State University of New York (Buffalo), the University of Illinois (Urbana), the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), and the University of Virginia. Yale University did not respond to this year's survey.

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

rector of Campus Security, and Dean of Agriculture. Several factors may account for the University lags:

- First, University administrators received an approximate average 5 percent merit increase effective January 1, 1991 -- reflecting only a six-month salary increase for the 1990-91 fiscal year. If these merit increases had taken effect on July 1, 1990, University salaries would appear more competitive.
- Second, the University's lag in several position categories may stem from the fact that comparison institutions may not have reported data for all comparative positions. If only high-paying campuses report data on a particular position, the average salary reported may be skewed. In addition, Yale University did not participate in this year's survey.
- Third, the University has in recent years added staff in various position categories. Adding new staff to selected position titles may have a net effect of lowering the average for those positions in that year.

Despite these caveats, Display 29 shows that four University of California campus-based administrator positions are paid between 0.03 and 12.0 percent more than their comparison-institution counterparts, while the remaining 13 categories are paid between 0.1 and 18.4 percent less.

Salaries Paid to Community College Executives

Pursuant to a Commission request, this year's report includes an analysis of salaries paid to community college district superintendents, campus presidents, and central office administrators. However, unlike the analysis presented above on State University and University executives, no benefit or perquisite data, and no system or campus comparisons with other states are provided. An analysis of benefits and perquisites, plus comparison institution data, would have required an extensive survey by Commission staff and the expenditure of significant resources.

Comparisons among district executives should also be viewed with caution. Unlike their University and State University counterparts, community college chief executives serve at the pleasure of their local governing board, and not the State-level Board of Governors. Therefore, the total compensation package and any concomitant contract for a district superintendent or college president is negotiated between the chief executive and the local governing board. There are no State-level deferred compensation or health/dental/vision plans provided to these executives, although all districts participate in either the Public Employees' Retirement System or the State Teachers' Retirement System. Salaries, benefits, and perquisites provided to community college executives are determined by district resources, the experience and educational credentials of the executive, and the size and scope of the district or campus.

District superintendents

Display 30 on page 48 shows salaries paid to 71 community college district superintendents as of October 1990. Many of these salaries have been increased since that reporting deadline. Like their counterparts in the California State University and the University of California, the level of salary paid to community college chief executives closely correlates to either district or campus enrollment and budget size. Last year the average salary paid to district superintendents was $91,872, and salaries ranged from $53,985 at Imperial to $119,700 at Los Angeles. (The salary paid to the superintendent of the Los Angeles Community College District does not include any additional stipends; all other districts did include stipend data.) Fifteen community college districts paid their chief executive $100,000 or more in 1990-91, and several more have exceeded that $100,000 threshold since the October 1990 reporting date.

Campus presidents

Community college presidents also show wide variations in salary -- among other reasons because several community college presidents are also the district superintendent, in that their district has only a single campus. Bearing this fact in mind, and as shown in Display 31 on pages 49-50, the average salary of community college presidents last year was $85,625, while the range of salaries was from $53,985 at Imperial Valley College (a single-campus district) to $106,009 at Pasadena College. Twelve community college presidents earned $100,000 or more as of October 1990, and, as with district superintendents, several additional presidents have since had salary increases that have put them over this threshold.

Chancellor's Office executives

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges is a State agency. Although the Chancellor (the system's chief executive officer) serves at the pleasure of the State-level Board of Governors, like all State agencies, his salary and those of his deputy-level executives are determined and regulated by various control agencies, including the Department of Finance and the Department of Personnel Administration. Salary levels for Chancellor's Office executives are set after these control agencies analyze salary levels for similar positions nationally, and after taking into consideration the salaries paid to other State agency executive officers.

DISPLAY 30 Salaries of California Community College District Superintendents, Fall 1990[1]

District	Salary	District	Salary
Allan Hancock	$105,829	North Orange	$99,500
Antelope Valley	89,506	Palo Verde	65,000
Barstow	75,000	Palomar	100,839
Butte	89,500	Pasadena Area	106,009
Cabrillo	73,908	Peralta[2]	104,500
Cerritos	99,999	Rancho Santiago	97,611
Chabot-Las Positas	95,000	Redwoods	90,000
Chaffey	84,204	Rio Hondo	99,652
Citrus	94,466	Riverside	100,887
Coachella Valley (Desert)	91,575	Saddleback	97,506
Coast	82,495	San Bernardino	98,760
Compton	84,533	San Diego	91,080
Contra Costa	101,511	San Francisco	99,999
El Camino	100,999	San Joaquin Delta	88,446
Feather River	82,150	San Jose	96,835
Foothill/DeAnza	87,563	San Luis Obispo	88,240
Fremont-Newark	99,997	San Mateo	101,111
Gavilan	85,000	Santa Barbara	89,442
Glendale	99,000	Santa Clarita	96,874
Grossmont	106,715	Santa Monica	89,922
Hartnell	95,400	Sequoias	90,504
Imperial	53,985	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	90,485
Kern	103,921	Sierra	104,529
Lake Tahoe	82,500	Siskiyous	83,427
Lassen	80,000	Solano County	82,332
Long Beach	101,144	Sonoma County	88,812
Los Angeles	119,700	Southwestern	105,933
Los Rios	97,000	State Center	87,420
Marin[2]	90,000	Ventura County	99,999
Mendocino	80,000	Victor Valley	76,000
Merced	76,351	West Hills	70,000
Mira Costa	92,852	West Kern	75,300
Monterey Peninsula	94,370	West Valley	103,125
Mt. San Antonio	96,336	Yosemite	99,902
Mt. San Jacinto	87,174	Yuba	93,327
Napa	89,934	**Systemwide Average**	$91,872

1. Includes single campus superintendents. Excludes employees on full and partial leaves. Excludes employees with less than 9-month contracts. Includes employees on 11- and 12-month contracts and employees with release time. Also many superintendents received salary increases after the October 1990 reporting date; thus the salaries of most, if not all, superintendents are currently higher than those shown.

Source: Staff Data File, Chancellor's Office Management Information System.

DISPLAY 31 Salaries of California Community College Presidents, Fall 1990[1]

Campus	Salary	Campus	Salary
Alameda	$74,200	Laney	$79,500
Allan Hancock	105,829	Las Positas	95,000
American River	86,000	Lassen	80,000
Antelope	89,506	Long Beach	101,144
Bakersfield	92,202	Los Angeles City	85,712
Barstow	75,000	Los Angeles East	87,409
Butte	89,500	Los Angeles Harbor	89,197
Cabrillo	73,908	Los Angeles Mission	73,863
Canada	73,305	Los Angeles Pierce	89,197
Canyons	96,874	Los Angeles Southwest	90,280
Cerritos	99,999	Los Angeles Trade	89,197
Cerro Coso	83,697	Los Angeles Valley	90,280
Chabot - Hayward	95,000	Los Angeles West	88,309
Chaffey	84,204	Los Medanos	101,511
Citrus	94,466	Marin	66,017
Coastline	82,495	Mendocino	80,000
Columbia	87,285	Merced	76,351
Compton	84,533	Merritt	79,500
Contra Costa	101,511	Mira Costa	92,852
Cosumnes River	86,000	Mission	84,750
Crafton	82,538	Modesto	87,473
Cuesta	88,240	Monterey	94,370
Cuyamaca	99,602	Moorpark	93,075
Cypress	85,968	Mt. San Antonio	96,336
De Anza	87,563	Mt. San Jacinto	87,174
Desert	91,575	Napa	89,934
Diablo Valley	101,511	Ohlone	99,997
El Camino	100,999	Orange Coast	80,933
Evergreen	76,852	Oxnard	86,970
Feather River	82,150	Palo Verde	65,000
Foothill	86,723	Palomar	100,839
Fresno	87,420	Pasadena	106,009
Fullerton	85,968	Porterville	86,009
Gavilan	85,000	Rancho Santiago	97,611
Glendale	99,000	Redwoods	90,000
Golden West	80,933	Rio Hondo	99,652
Grossmont	84,080	Riverside	100,887
Hartnell	95,400	Sacramento	82,500
Imperial Valley	53,985	Saddleback	86,271
Irvine	86,271	San Bernardino	87,339
Kings River	84,468	San Diego City	91,080
Lake Tahoe	82,500	San Diego Mesa	91,080

(continued)

DISPLAY 31 (continued)

Campus	Salary	Campus	Salary
San Diego Miramar	$86,748	Siskiyous	$83,427
San Francisco City	89,696	Skyline	90,241
San Joaquin	88,446	Solano	82,332
San Jose	77,609	Southwestern	105,933
San Mateo	90,241	Taft	75,300
Santa Barbara	89,442	Ventura	90,426
Santa Monica	89,922	Victor Valley	76,000
Santa Rosa	88,812	Vista	67,200
Sequoias	90,504	West Hills	70,000
Shasta	90,485	West Valley	88,000
Sierra	104,529	Yuba	93,327
		Systemwide Average	$85,625

1. Excludes employees on full and partial leaves. Excludes employees with less than 9 month contracts. Includes employees on 11-12 month contracts and employees with release time. Also many community college presidents received salary increases after the October 1990 reporting date; thus the salaries of most, if not all, of these presidents are currently higher than those shown.

Source: Staff Data File, Chancellor's Office Management Information System.

Benefits paid to the Chancellor, Chief Deputy Chancellor, and the various Vice Chancellors are consistent with those paid to all State employees in management positions. Health/dental/vision plans, life insurance, and retirement benefits are provided through the Public Employees' Retirement System. A deferred compensation program is available and administered through the Department of Personnel Administration.

Display 32 on page 51 shows the 1989-90 and 1990-91 salaries paid to the Chancellor's Office executives. All executive positions received a 5 percent increase on January 1, 1991, except for the Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations who received a 15.4 percent increase, most of which was attributed to a reclassification of the position. Executive salaries ranged from a low of $61,488 to $106,404. Benefits are estimated at approximately 28 percent in additional compensation. The Chancellor receives the use of a car but no housing or entertainment allowance, although entertainment is part of his job responsibilities.

DISPLAY 32 *Annual Fiscal-Year-End Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the California Community College Chancellor's Office, 1989-90 and 1990-91*

Administrative Title	Fiscal Year Salaries, 1990-91	Fiscal Year Salaries 1989-90	Range of Increase Over 1989-90
Chancellor (exempt)	$106,404	$101,340	5.0%
Chief Deputy (exempt)	95,400	90,852	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Administration and Fiscal Policy (exempt)	91,224	86,880	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Human Resources (exempt)	83,952	79,956	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Vocational Education and Economic Development (exempt)	83,952	79,956	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Transfer and General Education (exempt)	83,952	79,956	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs (exempt)	71,220	67,824	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Chief Counsel 1, CEA	76,368 to 84,204	N/A	--
Vice Chancellor, Student Services and Special Projects CEA 2	67,572 to 74,508	64,356 to 70,956	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Policy Analysis, CEA 2	67,572 to 74,508	64,356 to 70,956	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Governmental Relations, CEA 1	67,572 to 74,508	58,560 to 64,560	15.4
Vice Chancellor, Special Projects, CEA 1	61,488 to 67,788	58,560 to 64,560	5.0
Vice Chancellor, Management Information System, CEA 1	61,488 to 67,788	58,560 to 64,560	5.0

Source: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.

Appendix A

Letter from Kenneth B. O'Brien to Gerald Hayward, August 9, 1979

August 9, 1979

Gerald Hayward
Director of Legislative and Public Affairs
California Community Colleges
1238 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Jerry:

As you know, the Legislature took several actions during the current session concerning the reporting of salary data. The first of these emanated from the Legislative Analyst's report and requires the Commission to include the Community Colleges in our annual reports on University of California and California State University and Colleges faculty salaries. The second action appropriated $15,000 to the Chancellor's Office for the purpose of collecting salary data for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 fiscal years. The latter action, however, did not specify the type of information to be collected.

It is my understanding that you discussed this subject with Bill Storey and agreed that we should develop a detailed list of the information we will require for our report. After that, I presume you will contact us if there are any questions or ambiguities.

Our questions fall into three categories: (1) full-time faculty, (2) part-time faculty, and (3) administrators. For each of these, we will need the following:

Full-time faculty

1. A listing of all salary classifications (e.g. BA + 30, MA, etc.) for each Community College District.
2. The actual salary at each stop of each classification.
3. The number of faculty at each stop of each classification.
4. The amounts of any bonuses that are granted to faculty, the number of faculty receiving them, the total salary of every faculty member receiving a bonus, and the reason for granting the bonus.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.
6. The total number of full-time faculty in each district.
7. The mean salary received by those full-time faculty.

8. The total dollar amount paid to full-time faculty as a group.

Part-time faculty

1. The total number of part-time faculty employed by each district on both a headcount and full-time-equivalent (FTE) basis.
2. The mean salary paid to each headcount faculty member in each district.
3. The mean salary paid to each FTE faculty member in each district.
4. The total dollar amount paid to all part-time faculty in each district.
5. A summary of the compensation plan for part-time faculty members in each district.

Administrators

1. A list of all administrative positions (titles) in each district.
2. The salary schedule for each position.
3. The number of headcount and FTE employees occupying each administrative position.
4. The actual salary paid to each employee in each administrative position.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.

A few words of explanation may be in order. The data requested for full-time faculty are very similar to those that have been collected by the Chancellor's Office for a number of years but which were not collected for 1978-79 due to Proposition 13 reductions. The only major difference relates to the detail on bonuses that was not clearly presented in prior reports.

We are asking for data on part-time faculty because of objections raised by Community College representatives. At the time our preliminary report on Community College salaries was presented, many Community College representatives, including those from the Chancellor's Office, complained that the data were misleading because part-time faculty were not included. To avoid that difficulty in the future, it is imperative that data on these faculty be included in next year's report to the Legislature.

We are also asking for data on administrators because of the concerns expressed by both the Legislature (on the subject of academic administration generally) and various Community College faculty organizations. I am not sure we will publish any of the data on administrators but we do want to be able to respond to questions should they arise.

The final item concerns the dates for receipt of the data. As you know, we publish two salary reports each year. Since the University and the State University report to us each year by November 1, we think it would be appropriate to set November 1 as a reporting date (for the 1978-79 data) for the Chancellor's Office as well. For the 1979-80 data, we would like to have a report by March 1 so that we may include it in our final report to the Legislature. In future years, the March 1 date should become permanent.

If you have any questions concerning any of these matters, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Kenneth B. O'Brien, Jr.
Associate Director

KBOB:mc

Appendix B

Selected Policies of California State University Comparison Institutions

Abstracted from Towers Perrin, *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University*, March 29, 1991.

Outside Income or Employment

University System A

Prior approval is required to engage in outside consultation and professional activities up to a maximum of two days per month, charged to annual leave (limited to 25 days per year).

University System B

- Prior approval must be requested from the Chancellor.
- Outside employment should not interfere with current job responsibilities or result in a conflict of interest with other university programs.

University System C

- An individual may not engage in outside employment if that activity will interfere with his/her professional obligation.
- Under state policy, outside or secondary employment income is limited to 20% of primary income.
- Outside employment should not result in a conflict of interest with other university obligations.

University System D

- Outside consulting engagements should not interfere with the executive's work or result in a conflict of interest.
- No prior approval is required to engage in outside consulting.
- At year-end, the executive has to disclose the nature of the engagement and the amount of compensation received.
- The engagement must be charged to annual leave.

Single Campus University E

- Outside employment should not result in a conflict of interest and requires prior approval.
- Outside employment should not interfere in assigned duties

Five Single Campus Universities

No policy is currently in place.

Salary Setting Policies

University System A

Annual market comparisons of selected comparable organizations are made to determine the Chancellor's and Presidents' salaries. The remaining executive positions' pay levels are determined in relation to the Chancellor/President. Internal comparisons include individual performance and the size of the institution.

University System B

As determined by the Board.

University System C

Last major survey was conducted five years ago. Salaries are discretionary and established salary ranges are annually increased by the government.

University System D

As determined by the Board for executives and in relation to the President's salary which is limited by state statute. Annual reviews are approved by the Board within state limits. Market surveys are

performed but current salaries are well below market.

University System E

As determined by the Board, merit and cost of living adjustments are applied to the existing pay scale. Availability of funds depends on the legislative appropriation.

Single Campus University F

The Board of Regents set the salary and salary increase guidelines in an administrative matrix. The President's salary is determined by the Regents in public session. A major adjustment may occur when a new President is hired, therefore forcing the Regents to look at the true market values.

Single Campus University G

The President's pay is determined by state statute.

Single Campus University H

Salaries are based on market conditions, generally the average.

Single Campus University I

Executive pay levels are approved by the State Board of Education upon the recommendations of the President.

Single Campus University J

There is no salary schedule; salaries are negotiated for individual positions.

Single Campus University K

Each position has a salary range and the executive is appropriately placed within that range.

One Single Campus University

Not currently available.

Appendix C

Selected Policies of University of California Comparison Institutions

Abstracted from Towers Perrin, *Analysis of the University of California, 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Study*, April 1991.

Outside Income and Employment

Most policies that exist cover broad groups of employees and are not limited to executives. Nonetheless, the policies conform, in substance, to the University's Policy 29, "Conflict of Interest." Specific policies are described below.

University Systems

In one system, outside employment is acceptable if it does not interfere with university duties. In another, faculty members and nonacademic staff are expected to arrange outside employment so as not to conflict or interfere with the overriding commitment of the university. In a third system, outside employment is permitted so long as activities are compatible and not in conflict with university interests. Non-university income-producing activities (including board of directors service) must be reported to the university. In a fourth system, outside employment must involve a total of less than 20 hours per term and receive the approval of the department head, dean, and president; additional work may be allowed with additional approval by the Board of Regents. Outside work done during leaves of absence needs no approval. Staff members may not advertise in a commercial way for this outside consultation practice. If university facilities are used for outside work, appropriate charges are made. In the fifth system, no employee may engage in other employment that interferes with the performance of the employee's professional obligation.

Single Campus Public Universities

The policy at one university recognizes the need for flexibility and leaves interpretation to the discretion of the President. The executive must have prior approval if there is potential for conflict of interest, time, or allegiance with university. Outside employment should provide benefit to the university as well as to the employee. Such relationships should not interfere with the employee's primary obligation to the university; outside commitments should not exceed one day per seven-day week. Exceptions to the policy include minor stock holdings, uncompensated service on Boards of Directors or compensated service on boards not in conflict with the university's position, or ownership of or equity in a corporation used solely for the employee's consulting activities. Commercial involvements deeper than consulting are reviewed on an annual basis by the president. A second university's policy focuses primarily on non-executives. It states that external consulting can be undertaken only to ultimately enhance the faculty's contribution to the university. Internal overload work with the university for supplemental pay may be undertaken only when a task is clearly outside the normal responsibility of the employee, is in best interest of the university and is within the time limits of policy. Approval must be granted by the dean or the provost; commitments cannot exceed an average of one day in seven.

Single Campus Private Universities

At one private university, senior officials may serve on boards subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees. Obligations to the university take priority over outside employment in conflict of interest questions, and all outside employment arrangements and reports must be in the name of the individual and not the institution. Another private institution requires complete disclosure to designated officials and prior approval of outside professional activities and requires that employees conduct outside activities in a manner to credit themselves, their profession, and the university. Outside employment including publicly advertised endorsement of commercial products or services or speaking on behalf of the university in any way is prohibited.

Officers, faculty, and staff have the obligation to avoid ethical, legal, financial, or other conflicts of interest. Officers who are in a position to make decisions favoring one or another outside interest must prepare a written statement annually affirming that they have no interest, direct or indirect, in conflict with the university and identifying interests which have potential for conflict. Officers of the corporation must report on outside commitments to the salary subcommittee of the executive committee; executive committee members must report to the chairman. Six universities report they have no policy in force.

Salary Setting Process for University of California Comparison Institutions

The University of California's salary setting process is similar to that used by most of the university systems and single campus universities in the sample.

University Systems

At one system, initial salaries are individually negotiated and subsequent increases are based on merit. At another, initial salaries are negotiated within a predetermined salary range and subsequent increases are based on performance subject to the availability of funds. At a third system, initial salary levels are approved by the Board of Trustees. Academic and administrative salary increases are based upon individual performance. Deans and directors review salary structures for consistency in accordance with individual performance records. Particular attention is paid to maintenance of salary equity for women and minorities in accordance with affirmative action goals. Nonacademic salary levels are governed by the state civil service. Periodic salary comparisons are made with competitive organizations; salary range adjustments are made annually (if funds are available). Each employee is granted a step increase on his/her anniversary; this can be augmented by "superior performance" increases at any time during the fiscal year. Another system indicates the initial salary for the President is limited by state statute; other executives' salaries are set by Board of Regents policy. Increases are made annually, with Regents' approval within limits set by the state. A fifth system sets initial salaries based on market rates. Subsequent merit increases are based on annual performance reviews. The sixth system sets salaries by Board resolution, using market data from peer institutions.

Single Campus Public Universities

One university reports the initial salary can be set anywhere within the salary range. Annual increases are given on the basis of merit. At another, initial salaries are highly competitive and commensurate with experience, education, and market conditions.They use peer salaries and market data to determine pay levels. Annual increases are based on merit; they use the average increase for faculty approved by the legislature as a guideline in establishing merit increase levels.

Single Campus Private Universities

At one university, initial salaries are set within job salary ranges. Senior management approval is required for salaries above midpoint. Salary increases are based on an annual performance review. The total increase amounts for each line area must be within budgeted target increases. At a second university, initial salaries are based on market rates and annual increases are based on merit. At a third, initial salaries are negotiated based on market rates.

Subsequent increases are made annually based on performance review and market surveys. A fourth sets initial salaries and subsequent increases based on market rates and internal equity. A fifth sets initial salaries within established salary ranges considering market rates, internal equity, and availability of funds. Salaries beyond the maximum of the hiring range must be approved by the Manager of Compensation, Office of Human Resources. At a sixth university, Senior officers review all individual proposed salaries of $70,000 or more -- new hires or increases. Senior officers also review any individual proposed base salary increases which are more than eight percent, except for promotional increases. This policy is currently under review and may be modified. The Board of Trustees at one university approves recommended initial salaries and pay increases for Senior officials. At another university, initial salaries are recommended by senior officers and must be approved by the Executive Committee. Annual salary reviews are conducted in the spring. The Executive

Committee approves all corporate and senior administrative officer increases. Finally, at one university, the Compensation Committee of the Board sets the initial salary based on market surveys and internal reference data. Merit and market movement is used to determine increases.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95: A Revision of the Commission's 1977 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs.* Commission Report 85-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985.

--. *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation.* Commission Report 87-36. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1987.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89: The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51.* Commission Report 88-9. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1988.

--. *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1987-88: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation.* Commission Report 88-30. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1987.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90: The Commission' 1988 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51.* Commission Report 89-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1989.

--. *Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University.* Commission Report 89-22. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1989.

--. *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1988-89: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation.* Commission Report 89-26. Sacramento: The Commission, September 1989.

--. *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1990-91: The Commission's 1988 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51.* Commission Report 90-10. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1990.

--. "Propectus for a Study of Part-Time Faculty in California Public Postsecondary Education." Commission Agenda Item 6, March 5, 1990. Sacramento. The Commission.

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. *Study of Part-Time Instruction.* Sacramento: Research Analysis Unit, Chancellor's Office, January 1987.

Towers Perrin. *Report on Total Compensation for Top Management, California State University,* San Francisco, March 29, 1991.

--. *University of California 1991 Top Management Total Compensation Report.* San Francisco, April 1991.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of September 1991, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Lowell J. Paige, El Macero; *Chair;*
Henry Der, San Francisco; *Vice Chair;*
Mim Andelson, Los Angeles;
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach;
Rosalind K. Goddard, Los Angeles;
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach;
Mari-Luci Jaramillo, Emeryville;
Mike Roos, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto.

Representatives of the segments are:

Joseph D. Carrabino, Orange; appointed by the California State Board of Education;

William T. Bagley, San Rafael; appointed by the Regents of the University of California;

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges;

Theodore J. Saenger, San Francisco; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University; and

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education.

The position of representative of California's independent colleges and universities is currently vacant.

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, its meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Warren H. Fox, who was appointed by the Commission in June 1991.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1990-91

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 91-14

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

90-28 State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1991: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1990)

90-29 Shortening Time to the Doctoral Degree: A Report to the Legislature and the University of California in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 66 (Resolution Chapter 174, Statutes of 1989) (December 1990)

90-30 Transfer and Articulation in the 1990s: California in the Larger Picture (December 1990)

90-31 Preliminary Draft Regulations for Chapter 3 of Part 59 of the Education Code, Prepared by the California Postsecondary Education Commission for Consideration by the Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (December 1990)

90-32 Statement of Reasons for Preliminary Draft Regulations for Chapter 3 of Part 59 of the Education Code, Prepared by the California Postsecondary Education Commission for the Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (December 1990)

91-1 Library Space Standards at the California State University: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language to the 1990-91 State Budget (January 1991)

91-2 Progress on the Commission's Study of the California State University's Administration: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Report Language of the 1990 Budget Act (January 1991)

91-3 Analysis of the 1991-92 Governor's Budget: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1991)

91-4 Composition of the Staff in California's Public Colleges and Universities from 1977 to 1989: The Sixth in the Commission's Series of Biennial Reports on Equal Employment Opportunity in California's Public Colleges and Universities (April 1991)

91-5 Status Report on Human Corps Activities, 1991: The Fourth in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1829 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987) (April 1991)

91-6 The State's Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation, Part Two: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1993 (Chapter 1324, Statutes of 1989) (April 1991)

91-7 State Policy on Technology for Distance Learning: Recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor in Response to Senate Bill 1202 (Chapter 1038, Statutes of 1989) (April 1991)

91-8 The Educational Equity Plan of the California Maritime Academy: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Language in the Supplemental Report of the 1990-91 Budget Act (April 1991)

91-9 The California Maritime Academy and the California State University: A Report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance in Response to Supplemental Report Language of the 1990 Budget Act (April 1991)

91-10 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1991-92: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (April 1991)

91-11 Updated Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1990 and Full-Year 1989-90: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (April 1991)

91-12 Academic Program Evaluation in California, 1989-90: The Commission's Fifteenth Annual Report on Program Planning, Approval, and Review Activities (September 1991)

91-13 California's Capacity to Prepare Registered Nurses: A Preliminary Inquiry Prepared for the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1055 (Chapter 924, Statutes of 1990) (September 1991)

91-14 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1990-91: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Supplemental Language to the 1979, 1981, and 1990 Budget Acts (September 1991)

91-15 Approval of Las Positas College in Livermore: A Report to the Governor and Legislature on the Development of Las Positas College -- Formerly the Livermore Education Center of Chabot College (September 1991)